
00059069

Digitized with financial assistance from
Mr.Aneesh Vasant Pradhan
on 21 February, 2019

SUNDAY.

ITS ORIGIN, HISTORY, AND PRESENT OBLIGATION,

CONSIDERED IN

EIGHT LECTURES

PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

IN THE YEAR MDCCCLX.

59069

ON THE FOUNDATION OF

THE LATE REV. JOHN BAMPTON, M.A.

CANON OF SALISBURY.

BY JAMES AUGUSTUS HESSEY, D.C.L.

HEAD MASTER OF MERCHANT TAYLORS' SCHOOL;
PREACHER TO THE HONORABLE SOCIETY OF GRAY'S INN;
SOMETIME FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, AND SELECT PREACHER
IN THE UNIVERSITY.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1860.

263.6
Hes/Sun
59059

Son-dayes.

Bright shadows of true Rest! some shoots of blisse;
Heaven once a week;
The next world's gladness prepossest in this;
A day to seek
Eternity in time; the steps by which
We climb above all ages; Lamps that light
Man through his heap of dark days; and the rich
And full redemption of the whole week's flight.

The milky way chalkt out with Suns, a clue
That guides through erring hours; and in full story
A taste of Heaven on earth; the pledge and cue
Of a full feast; and the out-courts of glory.

HENRY VAUGHAN, *17th Century.*

DIES RESURRECTIONIS DOMINICÆ . . . QUÆ TANTIS DIVINARUM DISPOSITIONUM MYSTERIIS EST CONSECRATA, UT QUICQUID EST A DOMINO INSIGNIUS CONSTITUTUM, IN HUJUS DIEI DIGNITATE SIT GESTUM. IN HAC MUNDUS SUMSIT EXORDIUM. IN HAC PER RESURRECTIONEM CHRISTI ET MORS INTERITUM, ET VITA ACCEPIT INITIUM. IN HAC APOSTOLI A DOMINO PRÆDICANDI OMNIBUS GENTIBUS EVANGELII TUBAM SUMUNT, ET INFERENDUM UNIVERSO MUNDO SACRAMENTUM REGENERATIONIS ACCIPIUNT. IN HAC SICUT BEATUS JOANNES EVANGELISTA TESTATUR, JANUIS CLAUSIS, CUM AD EOS DOMINUS INTROISSET, INSUFFLAVIT, ET DIXIT: "ACCIPITE SPIRITUM SANCTUM; QUORUM REMISERITIS PECCATA, REMITTUNTUR EIS, ET QUORUM DETINUERITIS, DETENTA ERUNT." IN HAC DENIQUE PROMISSUS A DOMINO APOSTOLIS SPIRITUS SANCTUS ADVENIT: UT CŒLESTI QUADAM REGULA INSINUATUM ET TRADITUM NOVERIMUS IN ILLA DIE CELEBRANDA NOBIS ESSE MYSTERIA SACERDOTALIUM BENEDICTIONUM, IN QUA COLLATA SUNT OMNIA DONA GRATIARUM.

LEON. EPIST. 9, *olim* II. *c.* 1. *tom.* 1. *col.* 630. *Fol. Venet.* 1753.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.


00059069

TO

CHARLES WILLIAMS, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD,

HON. CANON OF BANGOR,

AND PROCTOR IN CONVOCATION,

WITH THE PREACHER'S SINCERE REGARDS.

EXTRACT

FROM

THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

OF THE LATE

REV. JOHN BAMPTON, M.A.

CANON OF SALISBURY.

——— "I give and bequeath my Lands and Estates to the "Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of "Oxford for ever, to have and to hold all and singular the "said Lands or Estates upon trust, and to the intents and "purposes hereinafter mentioned; that is to say, I will and "appoint that the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford "for the time being shall take and receive all the rents, issues, "and profits thereof, and (after all taxes, reparations, and "necessary deductions made) that he pay all the remainder "to the endowment of eight Divinity Lecture Sermons, to be "established for ever in the said University, and to be per-"formed in the manner following:

"I direct and appoint, that, upon the first Tuesday in "Easter Term, a Lecturer be yearly chosen by the Heads of "Colleges only, and by no others, in the room adjoining to "the Printing-House, between the hours of ten in the morning "and two in the afternoon, to preach eight Divinity Lecture "Sermons, the year following, at St. Mary's in Oxford, between

" the commencement of the last month in Lent Term, and the " end of the third week in Act Term.

" Also I direct and appoint, that the eight Divinity Lecture " Sermons shall be preached upon either of the following " Subjects—to confirm and establish the Christian Faith, and " to confute all heretics and schismatics—upon the divine " authority of the holy Scriptures—upon the authority of the " writings of the primitive Fathers, as to the faith and practice " of the primitive Church—upon the Divinity of our Lord " and Saviour Jesus Christ—upon the Divinity of the Holy " Ghost—upon the Articles of the Christian Faith, as compre- " hended in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.

" Also I direct, that thirty copies of the eight Divinity " Lecture Sermons shall be always printed, within two months " after they are preached, and one copy shall be given to the " Chancellor of the University, and one copy to the Head of " every College, and one copy to the Mayor of the city of " Oxford, and one copy to be put into the Bodleian Library; " and the expense of printing them shall be paid out of the " revenue of the Land or Estates given for establishing the " Divinity Lecture Sermons; and the Preacher shall not be " paid, nor be entitled to the revenue before they are printed.

" Also I direct and appoint, that no person shall be qualified " to preach the Divinity Lecture Sermons, unless he hath " taken the degree of Master of Arts at least, in one of the " two Universities of Oxford or Cambridge; and that the " same person shall never preach the Divinity Lecture Sermons " twice."

PREFACE.

THE Lectures which are now presented to the reader, though preached before a learned audience, are arranged somewhat in a popular form, because the subject, at any rate, is one of general interest. Accordingly, with very few exceptions indeed, the quotations which appear in the text, from any but English documents, are so parenthetically inserted as to be capable of omission in perusal without injury to the passages in which they occur. They were of course omitted in delivery. They are inserted now, because many persons desire to have before them whatever is immediately wanted to elucidate the matter in hand, without the distracting formality of a note. A good many notes are attached to the end of the Lectures, and the writer believes that he has in no case withheld

any necessary explanation of his statements. But having himself felt the annoyance of constantly occurring figures of reference, he has left the text totally unencumbered. If the reader requires further assistance than the text itself supplies, he has only to turn to the appendix, and, under the page and line, he will generally find something to the purpose. The passages marked thus [ ] were also omitted in delivery; several other passages were much condensed, in order to bring the Lectures into a more moderate compass; but no statement has been materially varied, nor has anything of importance been withdrawn or added.

Thus much for the mere form of the Lectures. Why the subject of the Lord's Day should have been chosen by the writer for discussion, and chosen at this particular time, is explained at sufficient length in the First and Eighth of the series. The great indulgence, or rather the respectful attention which the Lectures have received from the University, and which the writer very thankfully acknowledges, at least proves the existence of a desire for information upon it. He has endeavoured to treat all the opinions which have come under review with

candour, and to abstain from any thing like censure of individuals. If he has been compelled, for clearness' sake, to use such terms as *Sabbatarian*, or *Dominical*, or the like, he has done so, not to cast a slur upon any particular school, but to indicate what he conceives to be its prevailing tendency. It may be, that with all his care, he has offended or may offend some. If so, he has only to request that dislike of certain historical facts may not lead to condemnation of him whose duty it was to bring them forward. His statements must be either correct or incorrect. If the latter, the obvious method is to refute them: but if the former, then, however much they may be opposed to prevailing notions, he should scarcely be made responsible for them.

The writer, however, is not by any means so anxious about any personal misconception, as he is for the destiny of that GREAT and DIVINELY APPOINTED RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION of which he has ventured to treat. Christ, he believes, will effectually defend His own Day, and preserve it, as hitherto, for His Church. But the present is a time of trial for it, partly from the over-statements and over-strictness of those who look

at it solely on its Divine side, partly from the under-statements or laxity of those who look at it solely on its human side. And then there is another difficulty. The Clergy are much divided as to the main points treated of in the Lectures. They are at issue as to the origin of the Lord's Day. The books generally current present them with most incorrect and varying accounts of its history. And it is scarcely too much to say, that cases of conscience brought before them as to what may or may not be done upon it, receive answers perplexingly contradictory. This diversity of opinion among the Clergy tells most unhappily upon the Laity. Even statesmen know not what to do with the Lord's Day—as various abortive attempts at legislation upon it during the last ten or twelve years abundantly testify.

The present Lectures claim but to be a contribution to a fuller and deeper consideration of the subject than it has recently obtained. They have not been thrown together hastily, or without much thought and prayer. And the number of the books which have been consulted, and of the opinions which have been weighed, will at any rate show that the writer's task has been

one of no small labour. He has indeed had the subject before him for years, and has been in the habit of noting down whatever he found bearing upon it in the course of his reading. His view was formed, and his materials were accumulated, for the most part, before his name was proposed to the electors. If he has rendered scanty justice to his great theme, it has not been for lack of industry, or from precipitancy. He has done what he could in a work which every one desired to see attempted, but which every one shrunk from attempting.

The obligations of the writer to those who have preceded him, he has acknowledged by copious references. But he desires here to render especial thanks to Mr. Dyce, R.A. for the perusal of an unpublished paper upon "The Ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism of the Church of Rome, anterior to the Reformation." This afforded him a valuable clew to one of the most difficult portions of the subject. It is stated in the body of the Sixth Lecture, that Hengstenberg on the Lord's Day (Martin's translation, pp. 69—75), has been consulted for the Continental history of the controversies in the seventeenth century. It may be added here, that in some cases the

very words of his learned and judicious summary of the events of that period have been adopted. In the Third Lecture two or three passages are taken from Mr. E. V. Neale's "Feasts and Fasts," an erudite and laborious work, of which some use has been made.

Having now completed his task to the best of his ability, the writer commends it to the judgment of his fellow-Churchmen, humbly hoping that, however deficient in itself, it may lead some to inquire into and value the Lord's Day, and to glorify Him who is the Lord of it.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

(*Delivered March* 11, 1860.)

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE SABBATH AND LORD'S DAY QUESTION.

MARK XVI. 1, 2, 5, 6.

AND WHEN THE SABBATH WAS PAST, MARY MAGDALENE, AND MARY THE MOTHER OF JAMES, AND SALOME, HAD BOUGHT SWEET SPICES, THAT THEY MIGHT COME AND ANOINT HIM. AND VERY EARLY IN THE MORNING THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, THEY CAME UNTO THE SEPULCHRE AT THE RISING OF THE SUN. AND ENTERING INTO THE SEPULCHRE, THEY SAW A YOUNG MAN SITTING ON THE RIGHT SIDE, CLOTHED IN A LONG WHITE GARMENT, AND THEY WERE AFFRIGHTED. AND HE SAID UNTO THEM, BE NOT AFFRIGHTED: YE SEEK JESUS OF NAZARETH WHICH WAS CRUCIFIED: HE IS RISEN.

Καὶ διαγενομένου του σαββάτου, Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα, ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν.

Καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, ἀνατείλαντος (*v. l.* ἀνατείλαντος) τοῦ ἡλίου.

Καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς, περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκήν· καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν.

Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς, Μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον· ἠγέρθη.

LECTURE II.

(*Delivered April* 22, 1860.)

THE HISTORY OF THE LORD'S DAY TO THE END OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

MARK XVI. 1, 2, 5, 6.

AND WHEN THE SABBATH WAS PAST, MARY MAGDALENE, AND MARY THE MOTHER OF JAMES, AND SALOME, HAD BOUGHT SWEET SPICES, THAT THEY MIGHT COME AND ANOINT HIM. AND VERY EARLY IN THE MORNING THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, THEY CAME UNTO THE SEPULCHRE AT THE RISING OF THE SUN. AND ENTERING INTO THE SEPULCHRE, THEY SAW A YOUNG MAN SITTING ON THE RIGHT SIDE, CLOTHED IN A LONG WHITE GARMENT, AND THEY WERE AFFRIGHTED. AND HE SAID UNTO THEM, BE NOT AFFRIGHTED: YE SEEK JESUS OF NAZARETH WHICH WAS CRUCIFIED: HE IS RISEN.

Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου, Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα, ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν.

Καὶ λίαν πρωῒ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, ἀνατέλλοντος (*v. l.* ἀνατείλαντος) τοῦ ἡλίου.

Καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς, περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκήν· καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν.

Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς, Μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον· ἠγέρθη.

LECTURE III.

(*Delivered April* 29, 1860.)

THE HISTORY OF THE LORD'S DAY TO THE END OF THE FIFTH CENTURY —AND THE GROWTH OF ECCLESIASTICAL SABBATARIANISM IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

GAL. II. 18.

FOR IF I BUILD AGAIN THE THINGS WHICH I DESTROYED, I MAKE MYSELF A TRANSGRESSOR.

Εἰ γὰρ ἃ κατέλυσα, ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω.

LECTURE IV.

(*Delivered May* 6, 1860.)

THE HISTORY OF THE SABBATH TO OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION.

COLOSS. II. 16, 17.

LET NO MAN THEREFORE JUDGE YOU IN MEAT OR IN DRINK, OR IN RESPECT OF AN HOLY-DAY, OR OF THE NEW MOON, OR OF THE SABBATH DAYS, WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME: BUT THE BODY IS OF CHRIST.

Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει ἢ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νουμηνίας ἢ σαββάτων,
Ἅ ἐστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

LECTURE V.

(*Delivered May* 13, 1860.)

WHAT THE SABBATH IS SINCE OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION.

HEBREWS IV. 8, 9.

FOR IF JESUS (JOSHUA) HAD GIVEN THEM REST, THEN WOULD HE NOT AFTERWARDS HAVE SPOKEN OF ANOTHER DAY.

THERE REMAINETH THEREFORE A REST, (A KEEPING OF SABBATH,) FOR THE PEOPLE OF GOD.

Εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας.
Ἄρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

LECTURE VI.

(*Delivered May* 20, 1860.)

THE LORD'S DAY ON THE CONTINENT SINCE THE REFORMATION.

JEREMIAH V. 10.

GO YE UP UPON HER WALLS, AND DESTROY; BUT MAKE NOT A FULL END; TAKE AWAY HER BATTLEMENTS; FOR THEY ARE NOT THE LORD'S.

Ἀνάβητε ἐπὶ τοὺς προμαχῶνας αὐτῆς, καὶ κατασκάψατε, συντέλειαν δὲ οὐ μὴ ποιήσετε· ὑπολίπεσθε τὰ ὑποστηρίγματα αὐτῆς, ὅτι τοῦ Κυρίου εἰσίν. Ex Vers. LXX.

GO YE UP UPON HER BATTLEMENTS, AND DESTROY; BUT MAKE NOT A FULL END; LEAVE HER UNDERWORKS; FOR THEY ARE THE LORD'S.

LECTURE VII.

(*Delivered June* 10, 1860.)

THE LORD'S DAY IN ENGLAND SINCE THE REFORMATION.

JEREMIAH VI. 16.

STAND YE IN THE WAYS, AND SEE, AND ASK FOR THE OLD PATHS, WHERE IS THE GOOD WAY, AND WALK THEREIN, AND YE SHALL FIND REST FOR YOUR SOULS.

Στῆτε ἐπὶ ταῖς ὁδοῖς καὶ ἴδετε, καὶ ἐρωτήσατε τρίβους Κυρίου αἰωνίους· καὶ ἴδετε ποία ἐστιν ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀγαθὴ, καὶ βαδίσατε ἐν αὐτῃ, καὶ εὑρήσετε ἁγνισμὸν (v. l. ἁγιασμὸν) ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν. Ex Vers. LXX.

(Conf. Matt. ii. 29, *καὶ εὑρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν.*)

LECTURE VIII.

(*Delivered June* 17, 1860.)

THE LORD'S DAY VIEWED PRACTICALLY.

Ps. CXVIII. 24.

THIS IS THE DAY WHICH THE LORD HATH MADE; WE WILL REJOICE AND BE GLAD IN IT.

Αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος· ἀγαλλιασώμεθα καὶ εὐφρανθῶμεν ἐν αὐτῇ. Ex Vers. LXX.

ERRATUM.

Page 282, line ult. for *as* read *which*.

LECTURE I.

MARK XVI. 1, 2, 5, 6.

AND WHEN THE SABBATH WAS PAST, MARY MAGDALENE, AND MARY THE MOTHER OF JAMES, AND SALOME, HAD BOUGHT SWEET SPICES, THAT THEY MIGHT COME AND ANOINT HIM. AND VERY EARLY IN THE MORNING THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, THEY CAME UNTO THE SEPULCHRE AT THE RISING OF THE SUN. AND ENTERING INTO THE SEPULCHRE, THEY SAW A YOUNG MAN SITTING ON THE RIGHT SIDE, CLOTHED IN A LONG WHITE GARMENT, AND THEY WERE AFFRIGHTED. AND HE SAID UNTO THEM, BE NOT AFFRIGHTED: YE SEEK JESUS OF NAZARETH WHICH WAS CRUCIFIED: HE IS RISEN.

Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου, Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα, ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν.

Καὶ λίαν πρωῒ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, ἀνατέλλοντος (*v. l.* ἀνατείλαντος) τοῦ ἡλίου.

Καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς, περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκήν· καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν.

Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς, Μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον· ἠγέρθη.

THE intelligent visitor of a cathedral, whether in England or on the Continent, is often surprised and puzzled by the traditions which he finds attached to it. He is assured with great earnestness, or at any rate with sufficient gravity by his attendant, that this or that part of the structure is due to such a person's piety, that at such a shrine some notable worthy paid his

devotions, or that it was through that pictured window, now perhaps illumined by a glorious sunset, that the same sun looked down mournfully on the passion of such a martyr. And here, adds the narrator, is the pillar before which he fell. Our visitor, we say, is perplexed—he is unwilling entirely to disbelieve the account—he has a sort of general notion that some building, which may have resembled this in many respects, existed on this site or near to it from a very remote date. The names of which he is told are those of historical personages connected more or less with the scene. But then he has some architectural knowledge, and this more than half convinces him that his informant is either mistaken in his facts or incorrect in his chronology. On consulting his books he discovers, that though the facts have a foundation in truth, they are connected with an older edifice whose associations have been transferred to one of a later age, perhaps through mere inadvertence, perhaps through a not unnatural wish to advance pretensions to antiquity for what one admires and reverences, perhaps through other motives not altogether so excusable.

As it is with particular buildings, so it is with cities. Rome was "the City of *Seven* Hills," even when more were taken into its circuit than the Festival *Septimontium* indicated. The line,

"Septemque una sibi muro circumdedit arces,"

how true soever of the infant settlement, was true only by accommodation of Rome in its maturer days. Still piety, or poetry, or both, tenaciously clung to the old name.

But I speak not of edifices or cities, except so far as the popular handling of their legends may illustrate certain points which are my more immediate concern. I dismiss them with the further remarks, that inquiry into the real state of their case is never objected to in the archæologist; that he is allowed, if he does it with candour, to sift their annals to the uttermost; and that nothing of real value is ever destroyed by his investigations.

And now I pass on to observe that this tendency of the human mind to invest comparatively modern things with the sanctions and associations of the past, is discoverable in its treatment of institutions; in its treatment especially of that Divine and Apostolical Institution, I mean "the Lord's Day," which (I trust not rashly, but rather as one treading on holy ground) I have undertaken to examine in such a place and before such an assembly. My excuse for doing so will be found in the following considerations. I believe that great confusion of thought exists on this deeply important subject, and that the institution in question, though sufficiently venerable in itself, has been regarded as identical with, instead of at the most analogous to, one of greater antiquity indeed, but of more

limited application, the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. I believe that from this confusion have arisen not merely misapprehensions of a speculative nature, but errors affecting practice, and productive of misunderstandings among brethren. I see that the result has been, on the part of the more learned Clergy, an avoidance of a topic which they cannot treat of logically and historically without being exposed to obloquy, and which they cannot treat of popularly without apologizing to their self-respect and sense of duty: on the part of the better informed Laity, a distaste for a doctrine, which, treated (as it generally is) illogically and with want of historical precision, they condemn together with its advocates, and dismiss summarily, either as a clumsy artifice or as a burthen too heavy to be borne. But I see, further, that this was not always so; that there was a time when Κυριακὴ and Σάββατον respectively had their meanings accurately and sharply defined. Hence I venture to hope that an attempt to re-state those meanings, and to clear up certain difficulties connected with them, may not be altogether in vain.

I will only make two requests; the first, that the liberty of candid enquiry, so readily allowed in other matters, may be as readily allowed here; the second, that my audience will carefully discriminate between two things, which, though essentially distinct, are often confounded in popular nomenclature, a respectful desire to

set an institution on its true basis, and a disrespectful desire to undermine it. I hold this institution to be, in a spiritual sense of the words, "The day which the Lord hath made;" "I rejoice and am glad in it:" and I believe the way in which it is regarded to be no uncertain index of Christian steadfastness or decline, "*signum aut stantis aut cadentis Christiani.*"

The terms of my subject are these: "The "origin, history, and present obligation of the "Lord's Day or Sunday." Philosophically speaking, these terms embrace the whole *reason* of that day, its past history, its present state, its transition to that state, its destination. Of the method in which I shall treat of it, and of the date to be assumed for its commencement, I shall speak presently. But, before doing so, as controversy on the subject has existed chiefly in, and on the borders of, the English Church, I would mention a few of the theories which have been propounded in England concerning it since the Reformation, an acquaintance with which may be useful to us in the discussion which is to follow. Their diversity will at any rate justify an attempt to exhibit some view which shall bind the conscience as scriptural, and satisfy the historical enquirer as consistent with early antiquity; which shall leave a law under Christianity, and yet involve no Jewish legality. I do not at this moment enter at length on their comparative merits or

defects. These will appear as we proceed. I do little more than state the theories themselves as concisely but as fairly as I can, giving not the exact words, but what appears to be the spirit of the several theorists.

Here then is the *first view*.

"Christianity admits of no distinction of days. "The whole Mosaic Law, call it what you will, "ceremonial, political, moral, has been fulfilled "and has past away. Christ did not Himself "institute, He did not give authority to others "to institute, nor may others institute without "His authority, any especial day of worship or "rest in lieu of or in succession to the Sabbath. "Therefore, the Sunday is altogether a fiction; "there is now either no Sabbath at all, or, if the "mere word be contended for, it may be under-"stood that a true Christian now observes a "spiritual-every-day-Sabbath, a type of the "better Sabbath in heaven." These tenets were advocated by certain Antinomians and Anabaptists.

And here is the *second view*, though, perhaps, chronologically speaking, it should stand after the third, of which it is the honest development.

"The Decalogue is altogether and in every "part of it moral. The Sabbath, therefore, "which is enjoined in it, is still in force under "Christianity, for our Lord did not come to "destroy the law. Though generally observed "on the first day in the week, it cannot be

" observed on that day without sin. It ought " to be observed on the Seventh day, that is, on " Saturday, and of course with all the rigor " prescribed both in the Fourth Commandment, " and in other parts of Scripture." This is what may be called the extreme Sabbatarian view. It was partially held in England during the seventeenth century. There are a few professors of it now, but they are chiefly to be found in America. Its most prominent champion was a certain Theophilus Brabourne, who published more than one work upon it. He was formally answered by Bishop Francis White, of Ely, whose name we shall meet with again.

Here is the *third view*.

"The Sabbath existed from the beginning, " was re-enacted and regulated by Moses, and " has never since been abolished or superseded. " The day indeed has been changed, but, as 'the " seventh day' and 'one day in seven' obviously " mean the same thing, we may fairly transfer " to the first day, whatever Scripture says of the " seventh day. Thus our Sabbath, for so we " prefer to designate it, must be observed as " strictly as was that of the Jews, in the wilder- " ness under Moses, or in Jerusalem under " Nehemiah." This is, on the whole, the Sabbatarian view as it appears in the celebrated work of Dr. Nicholas Bownd, which was first put forth A.D. 1595, and afterwards republished with additions A.D. 1606. It was formalized by the

Westminster Divines in the statements made in their "Confession of Faith" and their "Larger" and "Shorter" Catechisms. Two of their number, Daniel Cawdrey and Herbert Palmer, published a very elaborate work in vindication and explanation of it A.D. 1645 and A.D. 1652.

Here is the *fourth view.*

"Sunday is the Christian representative of an "earlier Sabbath, in fact of a Patriarchal Sab- "bath which may be presumed to have existed, "and of the Jewish Sabbath which is known to "have existed. Therefore it may justly be called "the Christian Sabbath. It may be called a "Sabbath, because we refer to the Fourth Com- "mandment for its moral sanction; it may be "qualified as the Christian Sabbath, because "Christianity has eliminated from the obser- "vance of that commandment whatever is Jewish "and ceremonial, and, on the principle that 'one "day in seven' is covered by the expression "'Seventh day,' has substituted a day of its own "for that which is specified in the document. "'The Sabbath was made for man,' asserts our "Saviour, that is, for all men, Gentiles as well "as Jews; and, though St. Paul says, 'Let no "man judge you in respect of the Sabbath days,' "he must of course be supposed to allude only "to the Jewish aspect of them. The change of "the day, the softening of the rigor of Sabbath "observance, both of which we allow to have "been made, no matter how or when, but pro-

" bably by the Apostles, are matters of minor " import, and do not affect the essentials of the " Fourth Commandment upon which Sunday " depends. We cannot, perhaps, observe our " Christian Sabbath as strictly as its letter en- " joins, but we must observe it as strictly as we " can, and we would compel every one to similar " strictness. Sabbath-breaking is as distinctly a " sin as transgression of any other part of the " Decalogue. With very slight, if any, modifi- " cations, whatever Scripture says of the rest of " the Seventh day is virtually said of the rest of " the First day. For all practical purposes the " two days are the same." This view is at present extensively held amongst us, in spite of what I shall venture to call its undue assumptions, its logical and exegetical difficulties, and its inadequate support from the history of the early Christian Church. It is obviously an attempt to engraft a modified form of Dr. Bownd's Sabbatarianism on the stock of Sunday. Perhaps it owed its existence, or at any rate its formalization in England, to a conscientious desire to counteract the license of the eighteenth century. Though prevalent before their time, it is, in the main, the view of Bishop Horsley, of Bishop Jebb, and of Dr. Burton. The difference, however, between this view and the third is one of degree rather than of kind. This view allows the Lord's Day to be in some sort a festival, although one of a rather sombre

character,. and so beset with restrictions and prescriptions as to furnish many snares for consciences. The third view converts it into a fast, a season of severity and self-denial, as in Scotland.

And now we come to the *fifth view*.

"The Sabbath was not enjoined on man at "the Creation. It was revealed in the first "instance to the Jews, a short time before it "was formally published in the Decalogue. The "Fourth Commandment is not a moral precept "(or contains only a very slight moral element, "the assertion of the principle that God is to be "worshipped at some time): therefore, as it is not "one of those which the Gentiles were blamed "for neglecting, so it is not binding upon Chris-"tians generally as a law of God, or upon "members of the Church of England in virtue "of the terms of their communion. Nay, the "very Decalogue itself is not binding upon any "Christian man as having been delivered on "Sinai, but in so far as it is binding, as a portion "of the law of nature. Though one urge that a "reference is made to the Creation in the terms "of the Fourth Commandment, this reference was "only made by anticipation or proleptically. The "Sabbath was a sign between God and the Jews, "and expired with the Jewish dispensation. As "for the Lord's Day, it is not, in any sense of "the words, a Sabbath, or a successor to the Sab-"bath. It is a purely Ecclesiastical institution.

"It has little if anything to do with the Fourth "Commandment. It has an origin, a reason, an "obligation of its own. The passages usually "cited from the New Testament do not imply "that it existed as an institution in the life-"time of at any rate the great majority of the "Apostles. It was not dreamt of till the end of "the first, perhaps till the middle of the second "century. It is scarcely hinted at in Scripture, "unless indeed we hold that St. John refers "to it in Rev. i. 10, which may be seriously "questioned. We do not believe that it is sin-"ful to do upon it what it may have been sinful "for the Jews to do upon the Sabbath, or "that it is incumbent upon us, even if it were "possible, to spend the whole of it in strictly "religious exercises, or religious contemplation. "Man is body as well as soul—and he has social "tendencies as well as personal responsibilities. "Sunday should give free play to his whole "nature. Thus far as to our idea of this fes-"tival, which we consider to be a positive ordi-"nance of the Church, not one dependent on "the Old Testament, or even on the New. If "you ask us, 'why then has the Fourth Com-"mandment been placed in the Liturgy in its "purely Jewish form, and in what sense can "you pray that you may keep it?' a reply is "ready: 'We pray that we may keep that law "so far as it contains the law of nature, and has "been entertained in the Christian Church, as

"also that God may have mercy upon us for the "neglect thereof in those Holy Days which, by "the wisdom of the Church, have been set apart "for God's public service.'" This fifth view, which I shall term the purely Ecclesiastical view, of the origin and obligation of the Lord's Day, has, as you are doubtless aware, been held by a great variety of writers in the English Church. Its leading expositors are Dr. Heylin and Bishop F. White. Bishop Sanderson agrees generally with the two writers just mentioned, but perhaps lays greater stress upon Apostolic practice and example than they do. It may, however, be said, that this learned man, and Archbishop Whately, (who has done so much to clear the bearings of the whole question,) though differing in many respects, hold more or less distinctly the Ecclesiastical view. Not that all these theologians have stated its positions quite as they have been given above, or indeed held all those positions. Nor again that they have all of them explained the way in which that view is compatible with the retention of the Decalogue in the Liturgy, exactly in the same manner. Dr. Arnold's exhibition of his opinion agrees to a certain extent with that of Dr. Heylin, but he has not gone over the whole ground. He adds, however, to it this remarkable corollary, which, if fairly deducible from the purely Ecclesiastical view, seems to indicate some unsoundness in it. He holds "that

" the establishment of the Lord's Day, whether " by the Apostles or by their successors, was an " after-thought, was a matter of Christian expe- " diency only, was the result of their disappoint- " ment at discovering that men could not at " once do without something like the provisions " of the abolished Jewish law. It was therefore " only intended to be a temporary re-enactment " of the spirit of the Fourth Commandment, " and was to endure no longer than men should " require such an aid to their Christianity. " The re-enactors of course hoped and believed " that this would soon cease to be the case; and " doubtless St. Paul, were he to revisit earth at " present, would be surprised to find that Chris- " tians had not yet learned to dispense with an " institution, too similar, alas! to that which " the Jews required." Another writer has gone yet further, and urged that " special days for " religious duties not merely argue a low state " of religion, but are, in their very nature, a " serious injury to religion."

The *sixth* and last view which I have to bring forward, that of Archbishop Bramhall, agrees with what is called the purely Ecclesiastical view in considering the Sabbath to be abrogated; and in disconnecting the Lord's Day from the particular provisions of the Fourth Commandment. The Archbishop has, indeed, an expression which introduces a Sabbatarian element into his system; he considers the weekly festival to be rather

changed from one day to another than superseded by a new institution. But apart from this inconsistency, his view invests the Sunday with a more imposing origin than does that which is purely Ecclesiastical, or rather bestows upon the word Ecclesiastical itself a deeper significance. "What was the authority by which this change "was made? If it was not made by our Lord's "authority, which there is no cause to doubt, "at least it was made by that of the Apostles. "It is undeniable that the Lord's Day is an "Apostolical tradition, and it is not so clear "that there is no precept for the change in "Holy Scripture. As for the manner of ob-"serving the Lord's Day, we obtain a guidance "for this, not in set terms, but from consi-"derations of the law of nature, and of the "evangelical law, and also from the positive "law of the old Sabbath; not by force of its "terms or by preceptive obligation, but by its "being explanatory of the law of nature." Thus writes Archbishop Bramhall—and to the extent of holding "the assembling upon the first day "of the week for the purposes of public worship "and religious instruction to be a law of Chris-"tianity of Divine appointment," Archdeacon Paley supports him. Bishop Prideaux and Bishop Cosin had anticipated him, and avoided that confusion between change and superseding into which he fell. But the venerable author of "The Saint's Rest," I mean Richard Baxter,

(though he also is partially Sabbatarian, and indeed holds that the Sabbath was communicated to Adam,) is perhaps the clearest expositor of the main points of this view. "I believe (says he), "1. That Christ did commission His Apostles to "teach us all things which He commanded, and "to settle orders in His Church. 2. And that He "gave them His Spirit to enable them to do all "this infallibly, by bringing all His words to "their remembrance, and by leading them into all "truth. 3. And that His Apostles by this Spirit "did *de facto* separate the Lord's Day for holy "worship, especially in Church assemblies, and "declared the cessation of the Jewish Sabbaths. "4. And that as this change had the very same "author as the Holy Scriptures (the Holy Ghost "in the Apostles), so that *fact* hath the same "kind of proof that we have of the Canon, and "of the integrity and uncorruptness of the particular Scripture Books and Texts: and that, if "so much Scripture as mentioneth the keeping "of the Lord's Day, expounded by the consent "and practice of the Universal Church from the "days of the Apostles (all keeping this day as "holy, without the dissent of any one Sect, or "single person, that I remember to have read "of), I say, if all this history will not fully "prove the point of fact, that this day was "kept in the Apostles' times, and consequently "by their appointment, then the same proof will "not serve to evince that any text of Scripture

"is Canonical and uncorrupted; nor can we "think that anything in the world, that is "past, can have historical proof."

Of course I have not intended this enumeration to be an exhaustive one. I have even purposely omitted such authors as embrace in their systems features belonging to very different schools—Hooker, for instance, and Bishop Stillingfleet. But on the whole, so far as I have been able to classify them, these are the leading opinions upon the relation of Sunday to the Sabbath which have struggled for mastery in England since the Reformation to the present hour. They have caused and are causing great contention, partly indeed by the principles supposed to be involved in them, but more, perhaps, (such is the practical character of the English people,) by the results to which one class of them leads, and to which the other is supposed to have a tendency to lead. I say "one" and "the other," for we may reduce the six to two. The no Sabbath or perpetual Sabbath opinion, and that which advocates the Saturday Sabbath, may be omitted from our estimate altogether; they are rarely to be found now, at least in a substantive shape, though the former of them has reappeared as an excrescence of the purely Ecclesiastical view. Of the remainder, the third and fourth may be called—I do not use the word in an invidious sense—the Sabbatarian, and the fifth and sixth the Dominical set of opinions. "These Sabba-

tarians (say the Dominicals) would introduce Judaism into the Christian Church, revive ordinances which have long since past away, impose upon consciences burthens which the Jews found too heavy to be borne, call acts by the name of sins which God has not so called; in fact, against the advice of St. Paul, submit 'to be judged in respect of the Sabbath days.' We find fault with the assumption (unheard of in the ancient Church) that the Fourth Commandment is the ground of the observance of Sunday; with the Logic which says, because God commanded aforetime that the seventh day should be kept holy by Jews; therefore the first day is to be kept holy by Christians now; and, as practical men, we find fault with the *tristesse*, and rigor which the Sabbatarian theory of Sunday would introduce into the cheerful dispensation of Christianity. Scotland is an instance in point."

"These Dominicals (thus argue the Sabbatarians on the other hand) evidently cast a slur on the volume of the Old Testament; evidently set at nought the word of God uttered at the Creation and solemnly repeated at the giving of the Decalogue; evidently use dishonestly a prayer which they breathe every time they publicly hear the Fourth Commandment; evidently substitute for a divine foundation of Sunday, one of mere human invention, the authority of the Church. Besides, as practical men, we fear that if we do not adopt and urge for the Lord's Day

the divine sanctions and regulations with which Scripture has invested and ordered the seventh day, men will gradually diminish their reverence for it, and eventually either throw off all restraint upon it, or, a few perfunctory services got through, spend the remainder of it, if not in licentiousness, at least in frivolity. The Continent may furnish a warning in this matter."

Which of these two antagonistic opinions has greater reason on its side—whether either of them is entirely free from objection or to be admitted without qualification—whether they have any, and if so, what elements in common, I now invite you to inquire, not indeed directly, but indirectly, by examination, that is, into the origin, history, and present obligation of that Holy Day which we have every interest in honoring, but which is very likely to be dishonored, if advocated on grounds inconsistent with Scripture, and with the facts of the world without and within. We live in an age in which the titles, so to speak, of our ordinances are examined into with most exact and juridical strictness. Men, rightly or wrongly, (for my own part I believe rightly,) demand that no weaker evidence should be given of the right of the Lord's Day to succeed, in whatever degree, to the honors of the Sabbath, than of the right of a family to possess the temporal honors or the estates of a family which has preceded it. And, let me add, if they find it laying claim to a sanction

which cannot be satisfactorily substantiated, they are inclined to look incredulously upon, or not to examine at all, the sanctions which it really possesses. So true are those words of Aristotle: Οἱ γὰρ περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ ταῖς πράξεσι λόγοι ἧττόν εἰσι πιστοὶ τῶν ἔργων. Ὅταν οὖν διαφωνῶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν καταφρονούμενοι καὶ τἀληθὲς προσαναιροῦσιν. I propose, under God's blessing, to conduct my inquiry by illustrating in succession a certain number of positions which appear to embrace the whole subject. With a statement of these positions I shall occupy the remainder of this day's Lecture.

That the Lord's Day (a festival on the first day in each week in memory of our Lord's Resurrection) is of Divine institution and peculiarly Christian in its character, as being indicated in the New Testament, and having been acknowledged and observed by the Apostles and their immediate followers as distinct from the Sabbath (or Jewish festival on the seventh day in each week), the obligation to observe which is denied, both expressly and by implication, in the New Testament.

That in the two centuries after the death of St. John the Lord's Day was never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it, as an institution under the law of liberty, as observed on a different day and with different feelings; and moreover, that, as a matter of fact, it was exempt from the severity

of the provisions which had been the characteristic of the Sabbath in theory, or in practice, or in both.

That after the first three centuries, a new era in the history of the Lord's Day commenced; tendencies towards Sabbatarianism, or confusion of the Christian with the Jewish institution, beginning to manifest themselves. These, however, were slight, until the end of the Fifth Century, and are traceable chiefly to and in the civil legislation of the period. Afterwards they developed themselves more decidedly; Sabbatarianism became at length systematized, in one of its phases, in the ante-Reformation Church both in England and on the Continent by the later Schoolmen, probably in their desire to lay down exact rules for consciences, and under a fancied necessity of urging the precedent of Jewish enactments in support of Christian Holy-Days.

That Sabbatarianism, of every phase, was expressly repudiated by the chief reformers of almost every country, (even by Calvin, the friend of Knox, and by Knox himself, who is supposed, though incorrectly, to have introduced it into Scotland,) and in particular that it does not appear in the fully authorized documents of the Church of England.

That Sabbatarianism, *as a dogma*, sprang up in England in this way. Men had been educated to reverence the Lord's Day, and hap-

pily retained their early prepossessions. But, in the reaction from the bondage of tradition which was the result of the Reformation, they determined, rightly enough, to believe nothing except what could be proved by Scripture. Unfortunately they went on to demand from Scripture, in reference to the Lord's Day, more than, as a law of liberty, it could be expected to supply, *i.e.* exact rules for the observance of the day, and passages in which the day (or something like it, for the age was not a critical one) seemed to be legislatively enjoined. Accordingly, (defending themselves, if assailed, by a false method of spiritualizing, or, unintentionally of course, by a transparent fallacy of an ambiguous term,) they took a good deal of what is said in Scripture of the Sabbath, and unhesitatingly applied it to the Lord's Day. To this period, by the way, must be assigned the common use of the phrase Christian Sabbath, which had hitherto been quite rare, if indeed it had been at all known in the Church.

That Sabbatarianism, *as a practical tenet*, was rendered acceptable to earnest men in England as a refuge, they may have thought it the only refuge, from the laxity with which the Lord's Day was observed even after the Reformation had fairly set in; such laxity being a remnant of Rome, whose practice differed much from the theory of her Schoolmen. But that it was not introduced *as a dogma* without attracting

immediate notice from writers, generally of a sounder character, but inclined to advance too far in the opposite direction; or *as a practical tenet* without provoking that almost systematic lowering in the tone of the Lord's Day which was evidenced in that strongest and strangest development of Dominicalism, the Book of Sports.

That meanwhile, through all the fluctuations of opinion within and about the English Church, and though her Prayer-book was frequently revised, Sabbatarianism never succeeded in establishing itself formally in any of her fully authorized documents.

That this assertion is quite compatible with the introduction into the Liturgy of the Fourth Commandment and the accompanying responsive petition (in the Second Book of King Edward the Sixth), which may be understood and used without either volatilizing that particular Commandment or impairing the authority of the Decalogue as in general moral.

That the position that the Fourth Commandment is binding in the very letter, and is *par excellence* the ground for the observance of our weekly festival, proves too much, for it would drive us either to the observance of Saturday (as the advanced and more consistent Sabbatarians urged) or, at the very least, to a Judaic observance of the Lord's Day.

That Sabbatarianism, the strange varieties

of which really demand serious notice, is a return not merely to Judaism but to theoretic Romanism.

That the mention of God's rest after the Creation in the Fourth Commandment, and the introduction of the word "Remember," do not *prove* that the Patriarchs observed or even knew of a Sabbath before Moses used the words, "To-morrow is *a* Sabbath," &c.

That this assertion is quite compatible with the existence of an hebdomadal division of time anterior to the days of Moses.

That it is strengthened by the fact that the heathen were never reproached with the non-observance of the Sabbath, which we may presume they would have been, had the obligation to observe it been a moral one, *i.e.* a matter of natural law.

That the Sabbath, as it appears in the Fourth Commandment, was of the nature of a positive ordinance on the part of the Almighty, and as a positive ordinance was capable of being annulled by the same authority, when it had served its purpose, without alteration in the constitution of His creatures; and that this is not the only instance of the occurrence of something positive in a table generally moral.

Yet, that the occurrence of a commandment to keep the Sabbath, in a table generally moral, implies that there is a moral element in that commandment, (not a moral tendency merely,

for this would embrace every type and ceremony, but a moral element,) viz. an obligation, cognizable by the moral sense, to devote some time, perhaps even a periodically recurring time, to God's service, and, inferentially, to rest from worldly occupations as a necessary condition to the performance of such obligation.

That the Sabbath, as it appears in the Fourth Commandment, was a development of such moral element in a manner suited to a particular people, and being thus rendered political and ceremonial, does not, in that form, come under the precepts that are called moral.

Yet that the political and ceremonial elements may be abolished, the moral element remaining and being developed in a different way by Christianity.

That the Creation labour and rest were exemplary, typical and consolatory, and were so understood by the writers of Holy Scripture and by the Fathers—the antitheses being,

Labour and rest generally.

Israelitic labour in Egypt and in the Wilderness and rest in Canaan.

The Old Dispensation and the New.

The Christian's labour on earth and the Divine peace which alleviates it.

The Christian's general course in this world, and his rest in the world to come.

That to state the Divine institution and Apostolical observance of the Lord's Day as we have stated them, is a very different thing from making the sacred character of the day depend upon merely ecclesiastical authority; yet that, in the highest sense of the word, such institution and observance may be designated as ecclesiastical.

That though the Sabbath, as an ordinance, has passed away, and though neither Apostles nor early writers allude to it or to the Fourth Commandment as a precedent or as the ground for observing the Lord's Day, we may conceive the analogy of them to have been among the reasons which determined the proportion of time which should be the Lord's.

That the same analogy may direct us, though in a much fainter degree, because of the different characters of the two dispensations, to the employments and enjoyments suitable or not unsuitable to the Lord's Day.

That on the Sabbath itself there appears to have been a greater liberty of employment and enjoyment than is generally supposed; and that our Lord, so far as He dealt with it, concerned Himself, not with proving that it was about to expire, (this it was to do, of course, when the ceremonial and political laws generally were to expire,) but in purifying it from superstitions, in making it practically useful so long as it should last, and in redeeming it from the charge of enjoining absolute inactivity.

That still, though the Lord's Day is not to be Judaic in the way of over-strictness, it is not to be Judaic (in the sense in which the later Jews were often reproached by the Fathers for the use of their Sabbaths) in the way of license; *i.e.* it is not to be a mere gala-day, as on the Continent with the Romanists, and, to a great extent, even with the Protestant and Reformed Communions.

That the origin and obligation of the Lord's Day being such as is supposed, Divine and Apostolic, the Church, subsequent to the age of the Apostles, has not (as Calvin and others imagined) ability to remove it to any other day in the week, but that her authority over it extends to arrangement of its services and recommendation of employments upon it, provided that "the diversity of countries and men's manners" is considered, and nothing is enjoined, of obligation, incompatible with the "law of liberty."

That the Lord's Day being intended for the visible Church, in which evil is ever mingled with the good, it is not very reasonable to urge that it would be better if we could do without it. This might be so; but then the present state of things would have disappeared.

That the civil power should interfere as little as possible with the observance of the Lord's Day, but that, a due regard being had to the compound nature of man, it may fairly prohibit on that day what offers men profound tempta-

tions to forget their souls or to wear out their bodies.

Yet that, even here, care should be taken that there be not one law for the rich and another for the poor.

That the subject of prohibitions should be approached both by legislators and by clergy, as practical men, (so the preacher approaches it, having lived in a great city for years,) and with a due consideration for the different circumstances of town and country, and for the exigencies of society.

That the exercise of such consideration is no compromise of principle, but a lawful and necessary discretion in a matter upon which no definite directions are found in Holy Scripture.

That care should be taken not to impose burthens upon men's consciences which are too heavy to be borne, or to make that a matter of right and wrong which is really a matter of expediency. And this on two principles: 1st, that to break a merely supposed obligation while it is supposed to be a real one, has a weakening effect upon the character; 2d, that an advocacy of what is right on insufficient grounds is sooner or later exposed and called a pious fraud, and produces disgust of all pious injunctions, whether frauds or no.

That such an injunction as the following, if used by those who are not absolutely satisfied of the soundness of the Sabbatarian ground, is (for

truth can do no harm) a very faithless and timorous policy; "Do not loosen men's adherence to the Fourth Commandment, lest they neglect the Lord's Day altogether."

That, since much will, after all, be left to individuals, the law of charity should induce every one who can rest when he likes, to promote and procure rest on the Lord's Day for those who are otherwise circumstanced.

That the present state of the controversy respecting the observance of the Lord's Day is owing to these facts: first, that each side overstates a truth by the implied addition of the word *exclusively;* one side saying, "Men's souls are to be cared for [exclusively]," the other, "Men's bodies are to be cared for [exclusively];" and, secondly, that while the Sabbatarian ground is wrongly presumed to be the true and only ground on which the care of men's souls can be maintained, the Dominical ground is unfairly charged with leading necessarily to exclusive regard for men's bodies.

That in reference to such social questions as whether places of mere amusement or of secular instruction should be opened, or travelling permitted at all, or if at all in what degree, and the like, on the Lord's Day, principles should rather be sought for than exact rules.

That, on the whole, the Lord's Day, being an institution so Divine and especially Christian, so commended to us by prescription and universal

adoption, even from the Apostles' time, so wonderfully preserved to us through many vicissitudes, so founded on moral obligation, so recommended to us by the analogy of the Jewish polity, so adapted *a priori* to the whole nature of man, so recommended *a posteriori* by the advantages which many ages have enjoyed under it, should be jealously guarded from vitiation, should not be made a yoke of bondage on the one hand, or a cloke for licentiousness on the other.

> "The Sundays of man's life
> Threaded together on Time's string,
> Make bracelets to adorn the wife
> Of the eternal, glorious King.
> On Sunday, heaven's gate stands ope;
> Blessings are plentiful and rife
> More plentiful than hope."

We shall, if God permit, begin our formal discussion in the next Lecture, taking as our starting-point the moment indicated in the text. The last Sabbath of the old dispensation, that is, the Saturday of our Lord's lying in the grave (called afterwards by the ancient Church the *Sabbatum Magnum*), has passed, and with it the honor of the seventh day has passed away. It is very early in the morning, the first day of the week. The sun has risen. The Sun of Righteousness has risen also. The first day of the week has become "The Lord's Day."

LECTURE II.

MARK XVI. 1, 2, 5, 6.

AND WHEN THE SABBATH WAS PAST, MARY MAGDALENE, AND MARY THE MOTHER OF JAMES, AND SALOME, HAD BOUGHT SWEET SPICES, THAT THEY MIGHT COME AND ANOINT HIM. AND VERY EARLY IN THE MORNING THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, THEY CAME UNTO THE SEPULCHRE AT THE RISING OF THE SUN. AND ENTERING INTO THE SEPULCHRE, THEY SAW A YOUNG MAN SITTING ON THE RIGHT SIDE, CLOTHED IN A LONG WHITE GARMENT, AND THEY WERE AFFRIGHTED. AND HE SAID UNTO THEM, BE NOT AFFRIGHTED: YE SEEK JESUS OF NAZARETH WHICH WAS CRUCIFIED: HE IS RISEN.

Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου, Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα, ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν.

Καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, ἀνατέλλοντος (*v. l.* ἀνατείλαντος) τοῦ ἡλίου.

Καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς, περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκήν· καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν.

Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς, Μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε. Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον· ἠγέρθη.

IT is very early in the morning, the first day of the week. The sun has risen. The Sun of Righteousness has risen also. The first day of the week has become "The Lord's Day."

With these words, you will remember, I closed my first lecture. Perhaps you may be inclined to suppose that I meant to imply by them that at the moment to which they refer, or almost immediately afterwards, the Lord's Day began to be

observed as an ordinance of the Christian Church, and to presume that our blessed Lord, either by the very fact of His rising from the dead on the first day of the week, or by instructions given to His Apostles during "the Great Forty Days," sanctified and set apart that day for His own service for ever. Now I meant nothing of the sort. I cannot see, on the one hand, how an act or a fact can establish an ordinance not necessarily connected with it, unless it is declared by the agent (as in the case of the Sabbath) that it is intended to give sanction to it. On the other hand, I find no Scriptural authority for asserting that though Christ did, during the interval alluded to, speak to His disciples of "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," this subject was amongst those upon which He held high converse. The extent of my meaning was this, that from that moment, the first day of the week, on which Christ "overcame the sharpness of death and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers," was invested with an interest not before attached to it, and became worthy of the new title which it afterwards obtained from the partakers in and preachers of Christ's Resurrection. Besides, I hold that the Lord's Day is, as to its origin, much on a *par* with Confirmation. And this, while it would at once exclude it from the category of positive institutions ordained by Christ Himself, would also enable me to claim for it (on this ground alone,

whatever others may be adducible) an Apostolic, and, so far as anything Apostolic can be called divine, a divine origin.

Now we usually call Confirmation an Ecclesiastical ordinance, and point to certain places in Scripture from which we argue that it was a custom introduced by the Apostles, and esteemed by them an element of the religion which they were divinely commissioned to declare to man, and, as far as it required immediate organization, to organize. For their practice in this matter we refer to Acts viii. 14—17 and xix. 1—6, which recount the proceedings of St. Peter and St. John in Samaria, and of St. Paul at Corinth. For their estimate of the custom we refer to Hebrews vi. 2, where "laying on of hands" is mentioned among "the principles of the doctrine of Christ," as a specimen of the fundamental points of Christianity. It would appear then that if Confirmation has this origin (which is generally admitted), and yet is of Ecclesiastical institution, that the word Ecclesiastical has, in reference to it and to ordinances contemporaneous with it and observed on the same grounds, a high and peculiar sense. In the Ecclesia and its authorities at that time were included inspired men, who, in reference to what they practised (I do not mean as men, but as regulators of the Church,) and what they ordained, were unable to err. *They* might say, in a sense that the Church could never say afterwards, "it hath seemed

good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Whereas ever since the time when the Canon of Scripture was closed, although "the Church has power to decree rites and ceremonies," and is represented in General Councils, yet her Councils, being "assemblies of men whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God." In fact the Ecclesia afterwards was composed of uninspired men, who, though they might enjoin methods of procedure,—let us say for the carrying out of what appears in Scripture,—might not bestow upon their ordinances a divine and lasting obligation.

We obtain, therefore, two distinct senses of the word Ecclesiastical—*the one*, co-extensive in the matters to which it applies with the term Apostolic, and in fact synonymous with it: *the other*, that in which it may be employed at the present hour, when, if deemed advisable, the Church might meet and make regulations, Ecclesiastical indeed, because they emanate from her, but only of human authority, and capable of being repealed the next day. It is in the former sense that Confirmation, that Orders, that *Infant* Baptism, and, I shall now add, that the ordinance of the Lord's Day, and whatever Scripture attaches to them, are Ecclesiastical. It is in the latter sense that whatever else is attached to them (not being actually read in Scripture or proveable thereby)

as necessary or desirable for their being carried out, and in itself of an indifferent or accidental character, is Ecclesiastical. In this sense, too, Church customs in general are Ecclesiastical.

If anything further is required to illustrate my meaning, let it be this—

Ordinances emanating from Christ are of two characters.

First. Those appointed by Christ Himself, as Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These are Divine in the strictest sense of the term.

Secondly. Those appointed by Christ, mediately through His Apostles, of which I have just exhibited specimens. These are Divine in a secondary sense of the term. Under this head would come things ordained by the Apostles, not merely in so many words, but by the precedents which they supply in their actions.

Ordinances emanating from the Church are also of two characters.

First. Exactly the same ordinances just described as Divine in a secondary sense. The Ecclesia practised them before the Canon of Scripture was closed, while Apostles were yet included among the Faithful, and before special inspiration had ceased. They are, therefore, not merely Ecclesiastical, but Scriptural, Apostolical, Divine.

Secondly. Such other ordinances as the Church has from time to time established in right of her general power "to bind and loose," not

in right of any special inspiration. Under this head would be included (I care not how early the practice, if it be post-Apostolic,) all Holy Days except the Lord's Day; such things connected with the celebration of matters contained in the two higher classes as do not actually appear in Scripture, and so are not of the essence of those matters; particular forms of worship; varieties of Liturgies; the mingling of water with wine in the Holy Eucharist; the use of Exorcism before Baptism, or of Chrism at Confirmation; and the like. These are merely Ecclesiastical; and even though they be admitted to be not contrary to Scripture, they would come under the things which "every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, or abolish." The practice of "praying standing" on the Lord's Day is another instance. This, though it was used very early, and is sanctioned by an Œcumenical Council, is rejected by the Western Church. It has no authority in Holy Scripture. But the Lord's Day itself we retain. It has authority in Holy Scripture, and besides has the testimony in its favor that things indisputably Apostolic have.

I shall scarcely, I think, be misunderstood in my employment of the word inspiration. I do not deny that Christ is, according to His promise, ever with the Church by His Spirit. I admit that purely Ecclesiastical ordinances are entitled to consideration, so far as they are

not opposed to Scripture, if agreed upon by the particular Church to which men belong. I only protest against what we should call in literary matters the uncritical fashion of making an authority to be an authority without much reference to circumstances. And whatever the spiritual guidance vouchsafed to the later Church is, I cannot hold it to be such inspiration as was enjoyed by the Apostles.

As little shall I be supposed to deny that everything good in the individual Christian comes down from "the Father of lights," and is of the Holy Spirit. This, however, again, is not the inspiration of which I am speaking, and which rendered the acts of the Apostles, considered as Apostles, infallible.

But to return. The distinction in the senses of the word Ecclesiastical, for which I contend, has not, I think, obtained sufficient notice. And yet it is a most important one. For, *first*, it draws a line of demarcation between what is inspired and what is uninspired in the Church's system exactly where one is drawn already by common consent between Canonical and Uncanonical writings. This once supposed to exist, men are no longer tempted so to associate the Apostles and the early Fathers, as to give either a semi-fallibility to the former, or a semi-inspiration to the latter. *Secondly*, it exhibits to the two parties who are at issue respecting the origin of the Lord's Day a possibility of mutual un-

derstanding. The Sabbatarians might learn from it, that whereas they allow that the Church has had something to do with the matter in some sense or other, for she has altered, according to their way of expressing themselves, the day of the observance of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first, they have something in common with their opponents. The Dominicals might learn from it how to strengthen the term which they press so much, Ecclesiastical, by admitting an inspired element into the ideas which it represents. They might also see respectively that the observance of the Lord's Day may be Scriptural without such resort to Judaism as the ancient Church both of Scripture and of the first three centuries never thought of; and, that it may be Ecclesiastical without being therefore capable either of being modified by change to another day than the first, or of being abrogated like any regulation of the Church, required perhaps for a time and "for the present distress," but to be supererogatory and superfluous bye and bye.

Seven texts are usually adduced from Scripture for the purpose of proving that the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh day to the first day. I shall adduce them also, but with a totally different purpose. They will show, *first*, that peculiar associations would be necessarily connected in the minds of the Apostles with the first day of the week. *Secondly*, that

on this day they were accustomed to meet, and recommended their followers to meet, and for certain religious objects. *Thirdly*, that whether from such associations or from the nature of the relation to their Lord into which they were thus brought on it, or from both united, the term "Lord's Day" was actually applied by them to it. This I think will at least amount to a high probability that the day would be chosen by the Apostles as characteristic of the New Dispensation, and to an evidence that it was so chosen. At any rate, if we may judge from parallel instances, it is all that the nature of the case allows. If you desire dogmatic statements on this class of subjects, I may say to the Sabbatarians, you will not find them in Scripture, in reference to Confirmation, Orders, *Infant* Baptism, any more than in reference to the ordinance now in question. And I may say to the Dominicals, you may desert Scripture if you please, and resort only to the Church of the next two centuries for authorities on these matters, but you will find there not dogmatic statements, but simply testimonies to the facts that the customs just mentioned were practised, "the Lord's Day" honored.

On the first day of the week, then, our Lord rose from the dead, and appeared on five different occasions to His followers—to Mary Magdalene, to the other women, to the two disciples on their road to Emmaus, to St. Peter separately, to

the Apostles collectively. After eight days,—that is, according to the ordinary way of reckoning, on the first day of the next week,—He appeared to the Eleven. There is no record of His having appeared in the interval, it may be (as Dean Owen and Bishop Horsley conjecture) to render that day especially noticeable by the Apostles, or it may be because they had already determined to meet on that day. But, however this may have been, on the day of Pentecost, which in that year occurred on the first day of the week, "they were *all* with one accord in one place." Thus, the day already associated with the fulfilment of one of our Lord's promises, His Resurrection, received a most signal mark in addition by the fulfilment of a second promise, the descent of the Holy Spirit.

We dwell not, however, on these facts, except to urge, *first*, that whether from accident (so to speak) or from intention, the main body of believers at Jerusalem were, on the first day of the week, assembled, and had religious communications made to them, or religious impressions wrought on them; and that, on the last occasion of the three, they began, having been benefited themselves, to convey religious instruction and religious gifts to the multitude who witnessed the effects of a certain miracle: and *further*, that if the Apostles be considered to be merely uninspired persons, and in that capacity to have

debated by what day they should mark their religion, and carry out what may be conceived to be a religious instinct, the duty of worshipping God specially on one day, (the cycle of seven being suggested by the form of religion from which they were gradually emancipating themselves,) they would have been likely to choose the day of the Resurrection. Christianity was in especial the "Gospel of the Resurrection."

But we proceed. At Troas (Acts xx. 7) many years after the occurrence at Pentecost, when Christianity had begun to assume a more settled form, we find that something of this sort occurred. St. Paul and his companions arrived there, and "abode seven days, and upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." Now one would think that unless the first day of the week had been already the stated day of Christian assembling, St. Luke's narrative would have run thus, "On the last day of St. Paul's stay, he called the disciples together to break bread, and preached unto them." But his language is very different—"the first day of the week," evidently their usual day of meeting for the religious purposes of "breaking bread" and receiving instruction, if there was any one present to instruct them. The matter of course way in which these circumstances are introduced seems to indicate that these were points already established.

It is fair to remark here that the phrase *κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον* includes both the Holy Communion and the *ἀγάπαι*, which at that time were invariably connected, though the latter are now disused. And if it be argued that *ἀγάπαι* were an Apostolic custom or institution, and so must be continued in the Church upon the principle given above, an answer is ready. The same authority which instituted them can annul them. Certain words are written by St. Paul to the Corinthians: "When ye come together, therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not." The *ἀγάπαι* are also glanced at by St. Jude, "These are spots in your Feasts of Charity," (*οὗτοί εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες*, verse 12) with at least a misgiving of evil. Now these two passages taken together prove satisfactorily, that though that custom was Apostolic, it was abused, and by Apostolic authority so discouraged that on the abuse continuing the Church was justified in disusing it. But a simpler method of reconciling our theory with the disuse of *ἀγάπαι* would be this. To consider them an accompaniment of the Holy Eucharist, in fact, an accessory of its ceremonial, suitable

in the earliest times, but, from the nature of the case, unsuitable afterwards. For the same reason, certain regulations about apparel, salutation ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ or ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης, and "having all things common," have naturally disappeared. Practices or injunctions also necessarily involving miraculous powers, Unction of the sick, for instance, are no longer to be used. To retain such Unction, now that either miraculous powers have ceased, or miraculous results are no longer expected, would be, as our Church justly styles it, "a corrupt following of the Apostles." "This (says Thorndike very pertinently) is laid aside in all the Reformed Churches, upon presumption of common sense, that the reason is no longer in force; being ordained, as you see, to restore health by the grace of miracles that no more exist." It is mere childishness to say with the authorized Italian Catechism, that "it *also* assists in the recovery of bodily health, if *that* should be useful to the health of the soul." (Ed ancora ajuta a ricevere la sanità del corpo; se quella sia utile alla salute dell' anima.)

I am perfectly aware that some have contended that "the first day of the week" cannot mean the first day, but must be either the end of the Sabbath, or the commencement of the second day. I am content, however, to take the Scripture as it stands. Those who are curious on this question may see what Augustine says in his thirty-sixth Epistle, (*ad Casulanum*);

and also Chrysostom on Acts xx. 7, and on 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

An additional feature connected with "the first day of the week" is introduced in the same unstudied manner in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the Churches in Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." St. Paul seems here to allude to the first day of the week as one already known for the celebration of religious duties, and which he need not therefore recommend for the first time. "On that day, then, he says, let each of you add to the other duties performed upon it, the duty of almsgiving." And though he does not expressly say that the λογία, or collection of alms, is to be made in the assembly taking place on that day, it seems reasonable to suppose that this would be the case. Every man would naturally determine παρ' ἑαυτῷ, by himself, what to give, and give ἕκαστος καθὼς προῄρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, 2 Cor. ix. 7. The words τιθέτω θησαυρίζων would thus apply to his assigning and devoting in his own mind, not to his house, as to the place in which the offering was made. For if it was made anywhere but in the assembly, St. Paul's wish would be frustrated, and the λογία from each of the houses would have to take place on his arrival. "This duty, he adds, I have already

enjoined in similar terms on the Galatians." (Afterwards he inculcated it, though more generally, on the Romans, enforcing it by the example of the Macedonians and Achæans.) "Do you sanctify your gifts by offering them on the day which you already reverence."

The next passage that I would cite is that well-known one in Heb. x. 25: "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another." It is true that the first day is not mentioned here in express terms, and that hence some have said that the passage is not fairly adducible for our purpose. To my mind it seems very apposite. It alludes to an existing practice too well known to need describing, ἐπισυναγωγή, or meeting together—and to a matter which was transacted at such meeting, exhortation—and to a neglect of that practice, of which some had been guilty, of whose fault the writer of the Epistle speaks gravely, and desires that the Hebrew Christians will not themselves be guilty of it. Now it is obvious that multitudes cannot assemble regularly without some stated time being appointed. If there is no stated time, no rebuke can lie. It would have been almost futile to say, "Assemble yourselves at some time," for the answer would have been, "We do so." The writer then must have been alluding to some stated time, and this can scarcely be any other than that which we have already seen was

dedicated to such a purpose, the first day of the week.

One more passage yet remains—that remarkable place in the Revelation in which St. John speaks of himself as being in the Spirit on "the Lord's Day," ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Now what was this day? Could it have been the Sabbath Day? But, if so, the presumption is that the Apostle would have called it by that name, which was not obsolete or even obsolescent. Could it have been Easter Day? To this we must reply in the negative, for the oldest Greek and Latin Ecclesiastical writers universally apply the term (at least in its unqualified state), as we now apply it, to Sunday, and not to Easter Day. Could it have been the Day of Judgment, ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου, spoken of in 1 Cor. v. 5 and other places? But surely St. John, though he might in spirit see the Day of Judgment, would not have spoken of that day as the time of dating his vision, especially when he mentions, in connexion with it, the place from whence he wrote, Patmos, and the causes which brought him thither. The only possible conclusion is that ἡ Κυριακὴ ἡμέρα of St. John is the first day of the week, already as we have seen marked so signally, both by the event celebrated on it historically and by the duties performed upon it practically. This, now, being far removed from the world and wrapt up in the contemplation of the Lord Jesus Christ on His own day, he calls

by the name which had become usual in the Church to designate its divine origin and institution, "the Lord's Day." He himself was engaged on it, all solitary though he was, in thoughts and exercises, which, as they knit him to his absent brethren, so they joined him especially "to the general assembly and Church of the firstborn which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant," not "to the mount which burned with fire," or the terrors with which the Mosaic Covenant and its institutions, Sabbatical or other, had been enforced upon the Jews of old.

But you will of course have observed two things. First, that the first day of the week has only arrived by degrees at the honor which we suppose the Apostles by divine direction to have assigned to it. Secondly, that as we have made no mention of the Sabbath, that institution must either have determined altogether, or have been transferred to the Lord's Day. As to the prevalence of the Lord's Day being only gradual, it is obvious to remark that it was only gradually that the Apostles developed other doctrines. They were as cautious in their constructive operations, as they were tender and considerate in those which were destructive. Besides, a religion just struggling into existence, and exposed to the enmity of the Jews and to the suspicions of the heathen, possessed of no public edifices, and

therefore obliged long after this to hold its assemblies in private houses, in the open air, or even in deserted cemeteries, could not at once assume the regularity of a recognised or established creed. It is possible that the Christians were often obliged to intermit its observance for a while. So of old time, the periodical rest was occasionally intermitted, as when Jericho was compassed about seven days. The usurping Queen, Athaliah, was dethroned on the Sabbath Day. As to the determination of the Sabbath in the days of the Apostles, in one sense it had determined already. It was, as we shall show in a subsequent Lecture, part and parcel of the ceremonial and political law of the Jews, and died naturally when the ceremonies had been fulfilled in Christ, and the Jews, to whom it was a sign, had ceased to be peculiarly God's people. In another sense it lingered on for a while, though decreasing in honor and gradually less esteemed, as the Lord's Day increased in honor and became gradually more esteemed. Perhaps it was providentially arranged that it should not die out quite at once, in order that its diversity from the Lord's Day might be the better manifested. We have however to answer these questions concerning it. Were the obligations or rites connected with it transferred to the Lord's Day? or was any observance of a Sabbath, either on its own Day or on the Lord's Day, enjoined on Christians? And in whatever

way these questions may be answered, a third must be answered also: How is the mention of the Sabbath in the New Testament at all, and the apparent respect paid to it by the Apostles, after the Resurrection, to be accounted for?

The replies may be made almost as concise as the questions. In no one place in the New Testament is there the slightest hint that the Lord's Day is a Sabbath, or that it is to be observed Sabbatically, or that its observance depends on the fourth Commandment, or that the principle of the Sabbath is sufficiently carried out by one day in seven being consecrated to God. Whatever the Lord's Day had, was its own, not borrowed from the Sabbath, which was regarded for religious purposes as existing no longer. Nay more, when certain Judaizing persons had troubled the Church by insisting that the law of Moses was binding upon Gentile converts, the Apostles met in council. Their decision was that certain things should be *abstained* from by the Gentiles, but they did not enjoin any positive ceremonial observance connected with the older Covenant, not even the Sabbath. And to this it should be added, that St. Paul in writing to the Colossians (ii. 16) to the effect, that "the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us," was "blotted out by Christ," "taken out of the way by Him," and "nailed by Him to His cross," subjoins this remarkable exemplification of his

meaning: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." In writing to the Galatians (iv. 9, 10) he says, in like manner, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." No testimony can be more decisive than this to the fact that the Sabbath was of obligation no longer.

It has been urged here, that St. Paul is speaking only of the Sabbath as it existed among the Jews, or of their Sabbatical observances of which the Sabbath was only one, but that he did not intend to annul a Sabbath of more venerable antiquity, whose origin dates from the Creation. This is of course to assume a point which will be discussed hereafter, that the Sabbath existed as a practical ordinance before the time of Moses, and has claims upon us anterior to the Mosaical Law, and is not abolished with that law's abolition. At present I will merely say, this is only an assumption.

It has been urged again, that among the things to come was the Lord's Day, and that the Sabbath, the shadow of it, virtually subsists in the Lord's Day. This is to assume the whole point at issue, and, as we shall show hereafter by the authority of Scripture and by other great though subordinate autho-

rities, to mistake the typical object of the Sabbath.

It has been urged thirdly, that to adduce these passages is to prove too much; that they make the observance of all days, whether Christian or Jewish, either to be directly wrong, or to be a matter of indifference. This will be discussed also in its proper place.

Many passages, no doubt, occur in the Acts of the Apostles in which mention is made of the Sabbath. SS. Paul and Barnabas enter into the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia on the Sabbath Day. St. Paul speaks there of the prophets being read every Sabbath Day, in the course of his address to the people. He is asked to preach the same words to them on the next Sabbath. On the next Sabbath he complies with this request. At Corinth he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath. At Philippi he resorted on the Sabbath to a Proseucha or Synagogue-chapel by the river-side. At Thessalonica he reasoned three Sabbath Days out of the Scriptures. But why was the Sabbath thus selected? Simply because the persons to be converted in the first instance were Jews; because the Jews assembled on the Sabbath Day; and because, being assembled, they had those Scriptures before them out of which the preachers of the Gospel were to prove that He had come which should come. The Sabbath is only mentioned naturally and in the course of the narrative as the Day on which the Jews

could be approached and were approached in masses. Not one word is said by St. Paul or by any of the Apostles in honor of the day, or in commendation of its observance. It is curious too that though at the Council of Jerusalem St. James used the expression, "Moses is read in the synagogue every Sabbath Day," and thus incidentally brought the subject before it, it was not thought desirable to place the observance of that Day even among the matters which should be conceded to Jewish prepossessions. Accordingly, though the Jewish converts still observed it, though even St. Paul, perhaps, observed it occasionally, following the same rule of charitable allowance for his brethren's scruples that he did when he purified himself after the Jewish manner, and even circumcised Timothy, the son of a Jewish mother, and though, as we shall see presently, it dragged on a lingering existence for some time by the side of the Lord's Day, I think that the following propositions are at least tolerably clear;

That the Lord's Day (a festival on the first day in each week) is indicated in the New Testament, and was observed by the Apostles and their immediate followers as distinct from the Sabbath, (a Jewish festival on the seventh day in each week,) the obligation to observe which is denied both expressly and by implication in the New Testament. That being so acknowledged and observed by the Apostles and their immediate followers, it is of Divine institu-

tion, and so, in its essence, and in the circumstantials of it mentioned in Scripture, binding on the Church for ever.

I have said, that these propositions are *tolerably* clear. They will, I think, be proved to demonstration by notices to be found in writers of the next two centuries. From these it will appear that, as a matter of fact, in all places where Christianity was known, the same doctrine prevailed on this subject, not as requiring proof, but as a point which no one so much as thought of disputing.

Whether some *moral* consideration, which the Mosaical Law did not furnish for the first time, and which therefore survived its abolition, did not, from the nature of the case, constitute a reason for the institution of the Lord's Day which we are justified in finding if we can; and whether again *the Mosaic law*, as one development of that moral consideration, was not as in other matters, so in this, suggestive of something connected with it, are points which I reserve for the present. So far as we have gone, *the external character* of the Lord's Day at the close of the first century appears to be that of a positive institution of the New Dispensation. It is a day of Christian assembling at short periodic intervals of time, on which certain duties to God, to a man's self, and to his neighbours were performed. This positive institution would seem, both in its essence and in the circumstantials

which we have found attached to it, to possess whatever of Divine sanction origination by inspired Apostles can bestow. As a matter of fact the interval between one Lord's Day and another is of the same length as that between one Sabbath and another. But nothing Sabbatical, either in the sense of *commanded rest* (though rest to a certain extent would be a necessary condition to the fulfilment of its duties, and indeed, as we shall show hereafter, is implied in the very idea of the Lord's Day), or in the way of implication that the whole of it is to be employed in directly religious observances, or that such religious observances as are employed should be cast in a particular mould, or that such and such acts are prohibited during its continuance; nothing, I say, of this sort is to be found in what we may call the Charter deed of the institution of the Lord's Day. Whatever of this sort afterwards formally belonged to it, is of Ecclesiastical ruling in the lower sense of the term—is obligatory in a secondary degree only, in deference to the voice of the ancient Church, or to that of our own—or as suggested by the nature of the case, or by Christian charity, or by (what no good man will disregard) considerations of public utility.

Let us now see in what manner the Lord's Day was spoken of in the second and third centuries, both absolutely and in reference to the Sabbath. Other points (which I reserve

for future discussion) will be exhibited incidentally. Such for instance as the opinion of early writers on the question of the existence of the Sabbath before the days of Moses, and on the question of what the Sabbath was typical.

Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, is the first writer whom I shall quote. Here is a passage from his Epistle to the Magnesians, containing, as you will observe, a contrast between Judaism and Christianity, and, as an exemplification of it, an opposition between Sabbatizing and living the life of the Lord, (Κυριακὴν ζωήν. I do not think it necessary to reject, with Cotelerius, the word ζωήν.) "Be not deceived with heterodox opinions, nor old unprofitable fables. For if we still live according to Judaism, we confess that we have not received grace. For even the most holy prophets lived according to Jesus Christ. For this they were persecuted, being inspired by His grace, to assure the disobedient that there is one God, who manifested Himself by Jesus Christ, His Son, who is His Eternal Word... If they then who were concerned in old things, arrived at a newness of hope, no longer observing the Sabbath (μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες) but living according to the Lord's life (ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν Κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες) by which our life sprung up by Him and by His death, (whom certain persons deny,)... how can we live without Him, whose disciples even the prophets were, and in spirit

waited for Him as their Teacher? Wherefore, He whom they justly waited for, when He came, raised them up from the dead . . . We have been made His disciples, let us live according to Christianity."

Here is a passage from the Epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas, which, though certainly not written by that Apostle, was in existence in the early part of the second century. The writer says, in his explanation of Isaiah i. 13, (I do not defend this critically, but those whose exegesis of Scripture is indifferent may be admitted as witnesses to matters of fact,) something to the following effect: "We celebrate the eighth day with joy, on which too Jesus rose from the dead." (*ἐν ᾧ καταπαύσας τὰ πάντα, ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας ὀγδόης ποιήσω, ὅ ἐστιν, κόσμου ἀρχήν· διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς.*)

We now come to a pagan document, too well known almost to need quotation, the celebrated letter of Pliny to Trajan, written while he presided over Pontus and Bithynia. "The Christians," says he, "affirm the whole of their guilt or error to be, that they were accustomed to assemble together on *a stated day*, before it was light, and to sing hymns to Christ as a God, and to bind themselves by a *Sacramentum*, not for any wicked purpose, but never to commit fraud, theft, or adultery,

never to break their word, or to refuse, when called upon, to deliver up any trust; after which it was their custom to separate, and to assemble again to take a meal, but a general one, and without guilty purpose."

The next writer whom I shall quote is Justin Martyr. He flourished A.D. 140, and writes thus: "On the day called Sunday, is an assembly of all who live either in the cities or in rural districts, and the memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets are read." Then he goes on to describe the particulars of the religious acts which are entered upon at this assembly. They consist of Prayer, of celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and of Collection of Alms. He afterwards assigns the reasons which Christians had for meeting together on the Sunday. These are, "because it is the 'First Day,' on which God dispelled the darkness (τὸ σκότος) and the original state of things (τὴν ὕλην), and formed the world, and because Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead upon it." In another passage he makes circumcision a type of Sunday. "The command to circumcise infants on the eighth day was a type of the true circumcision by which we were circumcised from error and wickedness through our Lord Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week (τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων); therefore it remains the first and chief of all the days." As for σαββατίζειν, he con-

stantly uses that with exclusive reference to the Jewish Law. He carefully distinguishes Saturday (*ἡ κρονικὴ*), the day after which our Lord was crucified, from Sunday (*ἡ μετὰ τὴν κρονικὴν ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρα*), upon which He rose from the dead. He asserts, that the fathers before Abraham, and Abraham himself and his sons up to the days of Moses, pleased God, without keeping Sabbath (*μὴ σαββατίσαντες*)—that as before Abraham's days there was no need of circumcision, so before those of Moses, there was no need of *σαββατισμὸς* and Feasts and Offerings —that the New Law requires us to keep a perpetual Sabbath, a position which he contrasts strongly with the conduct which he attributes to the Jews, namely, their placing the whole of their religion in cessation of work for one day—(*σαββατίζειν* [*ὑμᾶς*, corr.] *ἡμᾶς ὁ καινὸς νόμος διαπαντὸς ἐθέλει, καὶ ὑμεῖς μίαν ἀργοῦντες ἡμέραν εὐσεβεῖν δοκεῖτε, μὴ νοοῦντες διὰ τί ὑμῖν προσετάγη*)—and that to turn from sin is to keep the delightsome and true Sabbaths of God. (*σεσαββάτικε τὰ τρυφερὰ καὶ ἀληθινὰ σάββατα τοῦ Θεοῦ.*)

I have only two remarks to make upon these quotations. You will have noticed Justin's employment of the heathen designations for the seventh and first days of the week. It should be remembered that before the death of Hadrian, A. D. 138, the hebdomadal division, (which Dion Cassius, writing in the third century, derives, together with its nomenclature, from Egypt),

had, in matters of common life, almost universally superseded, in Greece, and even among the Romans, the national divisions of the lunar month. And you will have observed also that the same writer who speaks of the whole of a Christian's life being a perpetual Sabbath, speaks also of Sunday being held in especial honor. It is obvious that, as Holy Scripture itself does, he is in the one case spiritualizing the now defunct Jewish Law, in the other, mentioning a Christian ordinance on its own independent grounds.

Two very short notices stand next on my list, but they are important from their casual and unstudied character. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, A.D. 170, in a letter to the Church of Rome, a fragment of which is preserved by Eusebius, says, "To-day we kept the Lord's Holy Day, in which we read your letter." (*τὴν σήμερον οὖν Κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάγομεν, ἐν ᾗ ἀνέγνωμεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολήν· ἣν ἔξομεν ἀεί ποτε ἀναγινώσκοντες νουθετεῖσθαι.*) Melito, Bishop of Sardis, his contemporary, is stated to have composed, among other works, a treatise on the Lord's Day. (*ὁ περὶ τῆς Κυριακῆς λόγος.*)

The next writer is Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, A.D. 178. His view respecting the Sabbath was this—that like the whole Jewish Law, it was symbolical, that it was intended to teach men to serve God every day, and that it was likewise typical of the future kingdom of God, in which he who has persevered in godliness shall rest

and partake of the Table of God. ("Regnum, in quo requiescens homo ille, qui perseveraverit Deo assistere, participabit de mensâ Dei.") "Abraham without circumcision, and without observance of Sabbaths believed in God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God. This is an evidence of the symbolical and temporary character of those ordinances, and of their inability to render the comers thereunto perfect." But coincident with this abolition of the Sabbath, his evidence as to the existence of the Lord's Day is clear and distinct. It is spoken of in one of the best known of his Fragments. And a record of the part which he took in the Quarta-Deciman controversy shows that in his time it was an institution beyond dispute. The point in question was this. Should Easter be celebrated in connexion with the Jewish Passover, on whatever day of the week that might happen to fall, with the Churches of Asia Minor, Syria and Mesopotamia; or on the Lord's Day, with the rest of the Christian world? The Churches in Gaul, then under the superintendence of Irenæus, agreed upon a synodical epistle to Victor, Bishop of Rome, in which occurred words somewhat to this effect, "The mystery of the Lord's Resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's Day, and on this alone should we observe the breaking off of the Paschal Fast." (*ὡς ἂν μηδ' ἐν ἄλλῃ ποτε τῆς Κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ τὸ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως ἐπι-*

τελοῖτο τοῦ Κυρίου μυστήριον, καὶ ὅπως ἐν ταύτῃ μόνῃ τῶν κατὰ τὸ πάσχα νηστειῶν φυλαττοίμεθα τὰς ἐπιλύσεις.) You will observe that while traditions vary as to the *yearly* celebration of Christ's Resurrection, the *weekly* celebration of it is one upon which no diversity exists, or is even hinted at. The latter is an established Apostolic day, the former is a mere Ecclesiastical ordinance, not settled till long after the Apostolic Era.

The next writer is Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 194. He has several passages very much to our purpose. "The Sabbath seems to me, he says, by refraining from evil things to indicate figuratively self-command." (δι' ἀποχῆς κακῶν ἐγκράτειαν αἰνίττεσθαι.) In the same work, he has (ἡ ἑβδομὴ τοίνυν ἡμέρα ἀνάπαυσις κηρύττεται ἀποχὴ κακῶν, ἑτοιμάζουσα τὴν ἀρχίγονον ἡμέραν, τὴν τῷ ὄντι ἀνάπαυσιν ἡμῶν, τὴν δὴ καὶ πρώτην τῷ ὄντι φωτὸς γένεσιν· ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα συνθεωρεῖται καὶ πάντα κληρονομεῖται) words which Bishop Kaye interprets as contrasting the Seventh day of the Law with the Eighth day of the Gospel. Clement takes occasion to reprove those who interpreted the *rest* of God (Gen. ii. 2) as if it meant that God had then ceased to work; for "He is good, and if He ever ceased to *do* good, He would cease to be God." As for Christian days, (observes Bishop Kaye), "When Clement says, that the Gnostic does not pray in any fixed place, or on any stated days or Festivals, but throughout his whole life, he gives us to understand that Christians in general

did meet together in fixed places and at appointed times for the purposes of prayer." We are not, however, left to mere inference on this important point, for he speaks of the Lord's Day as a well-known and customary Festival, and in one place gives a mystical interpretation of the name. (*οὗτος ἐντολὴν τὴν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διαπραξάμενος, Κυριακὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ποιεῖ, ὅτ' ἂν ἀποβάλλῃ φαῦλον νόημα καὶ γνωστικὸν προσλάβῃ, τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνάστασιν δοξάζων.*) It will hardly of course be supposed that I have quoted Clement as if I agreed with his view of the true Gnostic, beautiful and transcendental as it is, (Bishop Kaye gives a noble paraphrase of it), or that I at all accept the true Gnostic's spiritualization of the Decalogue. I only quote him as an evidence of the existence of the Lord's Day as an admitted fact, and as a recognized Christian ordinance, quite distinct from the Sabbath.

The great and learned enthusiast, Tertullian, is our next writer. His date may be placed at the termination of the second century. Of course I do not forget that he became a Montanist about A.D. 202, and that, therefore, the orthodoxy of some of his works is more than questionable. But I quote him, as in other cases, as a witness to facts. Here are some of his expressions :—"He who argues for Sabbath-keeping and Circumcision must show that Adam and Abel, and the just of old time observed these things." (Qui contendit et Sabbatum adhuc

observandum, quasi Salutis medelam, et circumcisionem octavi diei, propter mortis comminationem; doceat, in prætéritum justos sabbatizasse et circumcidisse, et sic amicos Dei effectos . . . cum neque circumcisum neque sabbatizantem Deus Adam instituerit, consequenter quoque sobolem ejus Abel offerentem sibi sacrificia, incircumcisum nec sabbatizantem laudavit.) Then he goes on to insist upon the idea which we have found elsewhere, that the Sabbath was figurative of rest from sin, and typical of man's final rest in God. It and other ceremonial matters belonging to the Mosaic dispensation, were only intended to last until a new lawgiver should arise who should introduce the realities of which these were shadows. Of the Lord's Day, he says, in other works, "Sunday we give to joy." (Diem solis lætitiæ indulgemus.) "We have nothing to do with Sabbaths or the other Jewish Festivals, much less with those of the Heathen. We have our own solemnities, the Lord's Day, for instance, and Pentecoste. As the Heathen confine themselves to their Festivals and do not observe ours, let us confine ourselves to ours and not meddle with those belonging to them." (Nobis, quibus Sabbata extranea sunt et neomeniæ et feriæ a Deo aliquando dilectæ; Saturnalia et Januariæ, et Brumæ, et Matronalia frequentantur, munera commeant, strenæ consonant, lusus, convivia constrepunt? O melior fides nationum: quæ

nullam solemnitatem Christianorum sibi vindicat, non Dominicum diem, non Pentecosten.) Again, "We consider it wrong to fast on the Lord's Day, or to pray kneeling during its continuance." (Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare.) And in speaking of some who refrained from kneeling in prayer on the Sabbath, he has the following remarkable expression, to which I would draw your attention: "Nos vero, sicut accepimus, solo die Dominico Resurrectionis non ab isto tantum (the bowing of the knee) sed omni anxietatis habitu et officio cavere debemus, *differentes etiam negotia, ne quem diabolo locum demus.*" Canon Robertson considers this to be the first evidence of cessation from worldly business on the Lord's Day. Neander finds in the passage indications of a transfer of the Jewish law of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day, and says that Tertullian seems to have regarded it as sinful to attend to any business whatever on the Lord's Day. I confess that I find in it nothing Sabbatarian—nothing in fact more than I should have expected considering that the Church had now become somewhat settled—that, rather than that the duties peculiar to the Lord's Day should be neglected, worldly business was put off to another day. It is especially said that this is not due to the Sabbath, or indeed to any other day whatever.

I now come to Origen. This writer speaks

very strongly of the duty of honoring the Lord's Day, which he says had its superiority to the Sabbath indicated by manna having been given on it to the Israelites, while it was withheld on the Sabbath. (Quod si ex Divinis Scripturis hoc constat, quod die Dominicâ Deus pluit manna de cœlo, et in Sabbato non pluit, intelligant Judæi, jam tunc prælatam esse Dominicam nostram Judaico Sabbato.) It is one of the marks of "the perfect Christian to keep the Lord's Day." As for the Sabbath, it has past away, as a matter of obligation, (as every thing else purely Jewish has passed away,) though its exemplary and typical lessons are evident still. [He has a curious comment, by the way, on the phrase ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς of St. Paul, which he supposes that the Apostle intended to contrast with the ὁλόκληρος καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ἑορτὴ of the faithful, both in this life and in the life to come.]

I will just mention that Minucius Felix, who lived A.D. 210, wrote a supposed dialogue, called "Octavius," between a Christian and a Heathen, in which the latter at length professes himself overcome. The following phrase is put amongst others into the mouth of the Heathen:—"The Christians come together to a repast on a solemn day." He indeed misrepresents the repast, but this is nothing to our purpose.

The next writer is Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. He writes thus, adopting the ordinary notion, that the Jewish Circumcision on the

Eighth day prefigured the newness of life of the Christian, to which Christ's resurrection introduces him, and pointed to the Lord's Day, which is at once the Eighth and the First. "Nam quod in Judaicâ circumcisione carnali octavus dies celebrabatur, sacramentum est in umbrâ atque imagine ante præmissum, sed veniente Christo veritate completum. Nam quia octavus dies, id est, post Sabbatum primus, dies futurus erat, quo Dominus resurgeret, et nos vivificaret, et circumcisionem nobis spiritalem daret; hic dies octavus, id est, post Sabbatum primus et Dominicus præcessit in imagine, quæ imago cessavit superveniente postmodum veritate, et datâ nobis spiritali circumcisione." And this passage, be it observed, has the greater authority, because it occurs in a synodical epistle, emanating not from Cyprian merely, but also from his sixty-six colleagues in his Third Council of Carthage, A.D. 253.

I shall conclude our present list by observing that Commodian, who is placed by Lardner about the year A.D. 270, mentions the Lord's Day; that it is contrasted, in a very remarkable passage, with the Parasceue and the Sabbath, by Victorinus, a martyr and Bishop of Petabio in Pannonia, (now Pettau in Styria,) A.D. 290; and that Peter, also a martyr and Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 300, says of it, "We keep the Lord's Day as a day of joy, because of Him who rose thereon." (*τὴν γὰρ Κυριακὴν χαρμοσύνης ἡμέραν*

ἄγομεν, διὰ τὸν ἀναστάντα ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐν ᾗ οὐδὲ γόνατα κλίνειν παρειλήφαμεν.)

We have now gone through the principal writers of the two centuries after the death of St. John, and I think that we have gained this as the result of our inquiry. That in these two centuries, the Lord's Day, (a name which now comes out more prominently, and is connected more explicitly with the Resurrection of our Lord than before) existed as a part and parcel of what was recognised as Scriptural (not merely as Ecclesiastical) Christianity; that it was never confounded with the Sabbath, but was carefully distinguished from it as an institution under the law of liberty, observed in a different way and with different feelings, and exempt from the severity of the provisions which were supposed to characterize the Sabbath.

Against this result I know of only three objections that can be urged.

The first is, that the passages now adduced from early writers have done service for a very different purpose, in fact that they have been alleged to prove that the Lord's Day is merely an Ecclesiastical institution.

The second, that considering the great importance which *we* are in the habit of attaching to the Lord's Day, they are hardly sufficient in number to warrant the belief that it was considered by the primitive Christians to be a Scriptural institution.

The third, that there is a wide difference between "keeping a day holy," and simply *commemorating* an event upon it, yet that the latter easily degenerates into the former idea;" and that therefore, though we admit that the primitive Christians commemorated the Resurrection of Christ on a given day, and even called it the Lord's Day, that day was not necessarily kept holy by them.

As regards the first objection I would say this. Let any one look at these passages and compare them with those which are adduced from Romish or from foreign Protestant and Reformed writers, in order to make out that the Lord's Day was always held to be of merely Ecclesiastical institution. He will find in these latter, direct allusions to Church authority, or mention of general agreement, or arguments from expediency, blended with confessions that after all the Lord's Day is not of Scriptural obligation on the conscience. He will find nothing of the sort in the ante-Nicene period. The writers speak of the Lord's Day, just as they speak of other matters which they have received from the original promulgators of Christianity. And they do this with so little effort, and so unaffectedly, that one cannot doubt the simplicity and heartiness of their belief. What the Church is found to be practising, is not necessarily a mere Ecclesiastical institution, but may have a higher sanction.

And now for the second objection. It is, I think, impossible to estimate the comparative importance of an institution in the ancient Church by the mere number of times on which it is mentioned. The Sabbath is seldom spoken of in the historical parts of the Old Testament, albeit it was "the sign" between God and the Israelites. It was always and everywhere implied. So the Lord's Day was implied, under Christianity. For it should be borne in mind that the Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα of old was the day on which the Κυριακὸν Δεῖπνον was celebrated, on which Christians realized their connexion with Christ and with each other, in a word, their "risen life," most especially. He who absented himself from this Ordinance virtually severed himself from "the Body of Christ" and relapsed into heathenism. It was, therefore, scarcely necessary, in addressing those who had no earthly inducements to be Christians, but had rather every discouragement to being such, to urge them to honor the Lord's Day. Their visible joining in the Ordinance of the Holy Eucharist was of itself a doing of honor to the day on which it was celebrated. Afterwards, when Christianity became tolerated, and still more when it was actually established, as the religion of the Empire, or as the religion of the several States into which the Empire was broken up, the tone of Christian writers altered considerably. It seemed necessary, as we shall

find is done in several post-Nicene documents both private and public, to warn Christians to observe the Lord's Day, and to partake in the Lord's Supper; to remind them that the Christian name was a mockery or a nullity, if unaccompanied with that visible honoring of their Lord in His Day and in His Sacrament, which those of elder times had gloried in and found to be their stay and support. Hence, though other causes were no doubt at work, arises the difference which will appear in the language of Theophilus, of Jerom, of Augustine, of Chrysostom, of the Councils of Eliberis, of Antioch, and of Laodicea, from that of earlier Christian writers. And, partially at least, to the same source must be traced, through the Middle Ages to the present hour, the gradually increasing practice of insisting on Lord's Day observance. So far, then, from considering the infrequency of exhortation to keep the Lord's Day to be an argument that it was not held by the primitive Christians to be a Scriptural institution, I conceive that it is an argument which tells just the other way. I should have been surprised to find more said about it. I should have suspected either the genuineness of the documents put into my hands, or a latent distrust on the part of the writers as to the *status* of the institution.

To the third objection it is more difficult to reply, not however so much from its intrinsic

weight as from the almost impossibility of finding common ground with those who speak of the stated celebration of Christ's Resurrection as "simply commemorating an event." It is a commemoration, indeed; but what is the event commemorated? Is it one like the Battle of the Nile or even the Battle of Waterloo, important indeed at the time, and involving great heroism and great suffering, but of which the effects may at length cease to be traceable even on the nations benefited by them, and in which the greater part of the world was never interested at all? Or, is it not rather an event unexampled in the history of our race, the triumph of the Son of God "made perfect by suffering" over His and our enemies, and one by which He who enacted it, not merely rose Himself but caused mankind to rise with Him, gave them a new principle of life here and became the firstfruits of their resurrection hereafter? Is it not an event which increases in interest, yea, which becomes more overpoweringly mysterious year by year, and hour by hour, as soul upon soul enters upon this scene of the flesh to perform his part in the strength of it, or departs from this scene "in sure and certain hope" of the benefits obtained by his Forerunner? He who knows "the power of Christ's Resurrection" cannot celebrate it as a man "simply commemorates an event," a dead past fact, in which his forefathers were chiefly concerned:

"Like circles widening round
Upon a clear blue river
Orb after orb, the wondrous sound
Is echoed on for ever."

He *must* adore the love and mercy which brought that event to pass, which sustains its efficacy, which makes it a living fact, yea, very life to himself. Such a celebration is not "a degeneration into keeping the day holy on which it is commemorated:" of itself, and in right of the ideas which it involves, it makes the commemorative Day a holy one. So we doubt not, that the early Christians, those who "of all men were most miserable if in this life only they had hope in Christ," did indeed keep with holy joy their Lord's Resurrection Day.

In a similar way may be explained the omission on the part of early writers of the *enforcement* of rest on the Lord's Day. They realized, very perfectly, I believe much more perfectly than we do, the Humanity of our Blessed Lord, and their own participation in His nature as the Son of Man. Hence, remembering that He "was wearied and sat by the well," the worshippers of the Son of Man, so far as they could, rested on His own day with Him.

But we must not further anticipate.

Many interesting points have been brought to our notice in the quotations adduced. The writers speak variously of the Sabbath, some insisting on the fact of its abrogation, some bringing out its allegorical and typical cha-

racter. And they speak variously of the Lord's Day; some referring to the Circumcision day as a type of it; some to the commencement of the manna shower, as an honor conferred by anticipation upon it; some to the primeval creation of light for its sanction; some, in fact the great majority, to the Lord's Resurrection as having been its reason. They are not critics, and perhaps we cannot always coincide with their exegesis of Scripture, or sympathize with all their expressions, either in the passages now adduced or in the rest of their compositions. But with every abatement, their negative agreement is most valuable. None of them speak of the Sabbath as binding upon Christians, or as connected with the Christian life, except in a typical and instructive sense; none of them identify it with the Lord's Day; none of them transfuse the spirit of the Sabbath into the Lord's Day, or refer either to the Fourth Commandment or to God's rest after the Creation for the sanctions of the Lord's Day. With the exception perhaps of what is said in that one passage of Tertullian, (which however need mean no more than I have attributed to it,) and with merely this difference, that a form of worship, an orderly arrangement of teaching, and of administration of the Lord's Supper have sprung up, and that recognised buildings for the holding of its Christian assemblies now exist, the Lord's Day is the same free and purely

Christian institution, after the lapse of so long a time, as it was when St. Paul preached at Troas, or St. John was in the spirit on the desert rock in the Ægæan.

The Sabbath, it is true, either through the charity of the orthodox Christians, or through the pertinacity with which Christians of Jewish descent adhered to their ancestral prepossessions, (as in an instance which I shall mention directly,) for a time obtained a partial respect. And provided that it was not insisted upon as necessary to be imposed on Gentile Christians, but only cherished as a matter of private regard, the Church did not seriously object to this. It was natural enough, that in the words of Hooker, "So long as the glory of the Temple continued, and until the time of that final desolation was accomplished, the [very] Christian Jews should continue with their sacrifices and other parts of legal service." They did so continue. The Apostles did not interfere with them; and even showed by their own occasional conformity, that they considered their prepossessions to be, under the circumstances, excusable, and in themselves harmless. Besides, as in the words of Bishop Stillingfleet, "The laws of Moses were incorporated into the very republic of the Jews, and their subsistence and government depended upon them, and their religion and laws were so interwoven one with the other, that one could not be broken off from the other," the Apostles

no doubt considered this adherence to the old forms to be a matter of national usage, with which, so long as it was not absolutely anti-Christian, Christianity was not bound to meddle. The Jewish ceremonies (says one of old), though *mortua*, were not *mortifera*. And the same charitable and wise forbearance was exercised even after the destruction of the Temple. The Nazarenes, (a name at first applied to all Christians, but eventually limited to Judaizing Christians, especially those who withdrew to Pella as the last days of Jerusalem seemed nigh,) were connived at, and, in their origin at least, considered to be orthodox, on this principle, that they merely took the law upon themselves without making any attempt to impose it on the Gentiles. But forbearance had its limits, even in Apostolic times. St. Paul would not circumcise Titus, who was a Greek; and so the Ebionites of the second century and later, who, besides their other errors, considered the Sabbath, which they rigorously observed themselves, to be of universal obligation, were held to be heretics. It is one argument against the genuineness both of the larger edition of Ignatius' Epistles and of the document called "the Apostolical Constitutions," that they go counter to the whole stream of ante-Nicene testimony and teaching,—the former in asserting that the early Church observed, the latter in asserting that it ought to observe, the Sabbath as well as the Lord's Day. (See Lardner, c. 85, and

Pseudo-Ign. to Magn. μετὰ τὸ σαββατίσαι, &c.) It is true, again, that other Festivals began to be added to the Christian ritual, and that certain Fasts began to be instituted, probably in development of an idea which is apparent in the New Testament, and which no doubt, under the divine guidance, influenced the Apostles in the choice of the day of the Resurrection as a weekly Christian Festival; that Christ is to be seen in everything, and that His course is a type and allegory and earnest of the Christian's life. But side shoots from a tree, so far from altering the character of the parent stem, rather evidence its vigorous existence, and the distance to which its roots have spread themselves in the adjacent soil.

And what if the Sabbath was considered in the Western Church (with the exception perhaps of the Church at Milan) to be a Fast, before the end of the third century had quite set in? It was so considered, not in right of its being a Jewish institution, *i.e.* not as the Sabbath, but in connexion with something altogether Christian. Friday had become a Fast, in commemoration of our Lord's Crucifixion; by-and-by this Fast was continued into the Saturday. Thus the Sabbath came to be observed by way of ὑπέρθεσις or *super-positio*, not for its own sake, but as a corollary to the day which preceded it. Somewhat later it formed a recognised part of the discipline and preparation for the Κυριακὴ,

the day of joy. The Eastern Church, professedly for reasons of its own, which will be noticed hereafter, but, no doubt, in consequence of the greater proportion of Jewish elements in its composition, gradually came to rank the Sabbath as a Festival, coordinate, or nearly so, with the Lord's Day. It is not exactly known when this became general in that branch of the Church. It may have become so in the ante-Nicene period; but probably, not for some time afterwards. It finds its chief encouragement in the Apostolical Constitutions, which relate principally to the Eastern Church. For the Western practice of fasting on the Sabbath another excuse was discovered in later times: "St. Peter fasted on that day to prepare himself for the dispute with Simon Magus." With such points, however, as the origin and obligation of Holy Seasons and Holy Days, beyond and besides the Lord's Day, we are not here concerned. The sole object of the latter part of this present Lecture has been to inquire whether at the end of the Third Century the Lord's Day remained the same simple and unencumbered ordinance which the Apostles bequeathed to the Church. I think we have answered this question in the affirmative. Whether it continued such, in the centuries from that date to the Reformation, I shall consider in the next Lecture.

LECTURE III.

GALATIANS II. 18.

FOR IF I BUILD AGAIN THE THINGS WHICH I DESTROYED, I MAKE MYSELF A TRANSGRESSOR.

Εἰ γὰρ ἃ κατέλυσα, ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω.

IT is very difficult to determine in what manner the celebrated edict of Constantine, which introduces a new era in the history of the Lord's Day, should be regarded, or how his motives should be interpreted. There is scarcely a single portion of it which has not been criticised, and criticised in different ways. The document itself is as follows:—

IMPERATOR CONSTANTINUS AUG. HELPIDIO.

Omnes judices urbanæque plebes et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturæ liberè licenterque inserviant, quoniam frequenter evenit ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis aut vineæ scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas cœlesti provisione concessa. Dat. Non. Mart. Crispo II. et Constantino II. Coss.

THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE AUG. TO HELPIDIUS.

On the venerable day of the sun let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in the work of cultivation may freely and

lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain-sowing or for vine-planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations the bounty of Heaven should be lost. Given, the seventh day of March. Crispus and Constantine being Consuls, each of them for the second time. (A.D. 321.)

One of the Westminster Divines, whose work has been already noticed, I mean Cawdrey, appears to think very highly both of the document itself, and of the position occupied by Constantine in working out the development of a law of the Almighty. In fact, he compares the Emperor to Moses, and intimates that he performed a part in reference to the Lord's Day analogous to that which he ascribes to Moses in reference to the Sabbath. His comparison is so unique, and is withal so little known, that I venture to quote it. It is part of a series of analogies, but I content myself with the first four.

"As the first Sabbath was kept, (it is probable,) by God Himself alone, and was propounded as a copy for Adam to imitate; so likewise the first Lord's Day was kept by Christ alone, and commended to the practice of His Apostles, and the Church's.

"Adam and the Patriarchs, whether by command or inspiration, did, (we think) imitate God in the observation of a weekly day, but in a different manner from after times, viz. in their private families, in which the Church, as then, resided. So the Apostles, upon the same grounds, (as we conceive) imitated their Lord

and Master, but in private families at first, or private meetings, not so publicly as afterward.

"The children of Israel (the then only people of God) being in Egypt, under sore pressure, nor did, nor could keep the Sabbath in any solemn manner, not being permitted either rest or assemblies. So the Church of the New Testament for three hundred years, living in persecution, could not keep the Lord's Day with that solemnity that they should or would; but as for place secretly, so for time as they could find opportunity, in the day or night.

"The want of a settled government and a governor of their own, together with the former consideration, made some think that Moses was the first that settled the Sabbath, so that however the observation of it might be voluntary before, yet not necessary till now: so, the want of a Christian magistrate for the first three hundred years of the Church, makes some also think and say, that Constantine was the first that commanded the observation of the Lord's Day: whereas Moses did but revive what was by long tract of time almost obliterated, nor did Constantine constitute but confirm the day which had been from the very Apostles' times, and by the Apostles themselves instituted, and by the succeeding Churches constantly observed, as well as they might. And this is so certainly and confessedly true, that we cannot but wonder that

any should ever question it. And herein they are alike; that as Moses did settle the observation of the Sabbath, not institute it; so, the most that Constantine did, was but to rectify the observation of the Lord's Day, not to appoint the day itself."

There can be little doubt that Constantine is unduly exalted by this comparison of him to the Jewish Lawgiver, who, whatever he did in reference to the Sabbath, whether he instituted it or revived it, (a question which I waive for the present) was directly commissioned from heaven.

It is worth noticing, too, that though Eusebius has anticipated our Presbyterian writer in instituting an historical parallel between these two personages, he ignores the very points from which the other has drawn his parallel.

Others have looked at the transaction in a totally different light, and refused to discover in the document, or to suppose in the mind of the enactor, any recognition of the Lord's Day as a matter of divine obligation. They remark, and very truly, that Constantine designates it by its astrological or heathen title, Dies Solis, and insist that the epithet *venerabilis* with which it is introduced has reference to the rites performed on that day in honor of Hercules, Apollo and Mithras. And in support of their assertion they urge that in the same year Constantine promulgated an edict of an unquestionably heathen character for the better observance of sacrificial

customs. They would have it that the edict is purely a kalendarial regulation, and that the Dies Solis is only rendered by it a holiday in a civil sense, not authoritatively stamped as a holy day, much less as the Lord's Day in a religious sense—that much confusion had arisen by the astrological week being all but universally employed in private matters, while for public purposes the older division by Kalends, Nones, Ides and Nundines prevailed—that festivals had become multiplied and diversified, according to the diversities of religions, to a very inconvenient extent (this had been a matter of complaint as long ago as the *Actiones Verrinæ*)—and that therefore he determined to compose these chronological difficulties, by a weekly holiday, which would be acceptable in the existing state of public feeling, both to his heathen and to his Christian subjects.

A still lower view of the transaction is this. It is known from several sources that the heathen deity to whom, before his conversion, the Emperor professed to be especially devoted, was Sol or Apollo. It is known also, that whether from their constant use of the Scripture phrase, "the Sun of Righteousness," which described Christ as ὁ μέγας ἥλιος, or from their Holy Day being ἡ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρα, or from their ordinary practice of praying towards the East, the Christians were popularly represented as sun-worshippers. In vain had Tertullian and others protested against

such a misrepresentation. This, and many other extravagant fables were widely spread and currently believed. Constantine, as yet only partially informed as to the nature of Christianity, may have been somewhat misled by it. He had an empire of strangely jarring elements which required to be consolidated. The best bond of union was obviously agreement in religion. Accordingly, he may have had in view the formation of a hybrid creed, which should embrace the common points and carefully suppress the differences of heathenism and Christianity. Neither his own heathenism nor that of his day was of the old-fashioned sensuous kind, which would assign the statue of Christ a place in the Pantheon, or receive Christ among the gods. It was of a more abstract character, and an abstract religion was easily confounded with a spiritual religion. Besides, his own consistency as a sun-worshipper was to be maintained. A regulation in honor of the sun might unite his subjects—promote the truth—and exhibit himself, though a reformer in religious matters, yet one whose own belief had been always in the right direction.

But to return to the purely Theological aspect of the edict.

Prohibition of work, &c. in the cities, some have regarded as an approximation to Sabbatarianism unknown before in the Church, and lamented it as being an infringement of Christian liberty.

Others, on the contrary, have considered it to be a movement in the right direction, but not to have gone so far as it was desirable it should have gone. Hooker, for instance, writes thus: "The Emperor Constantine having with over great facility licensed Sunday labour in country villages, under that pretence whereof there may justly no doubt sometimes consideration be had, namely lest anything which God by his Providence hath bestowed should miscarry, not being taken in due time; Leo, which afterwards saw that this ground would not bear so general and large indulgence as hath been granted, doth by a contrary edict, both reverse and severely censure his predecessor's remissness."

Others, as Heylin, considering the observance of the Lord's Day to be altogether a matter of custom, (though of Ecclesiastical custom,) and so to be much on a *par* with the observance of other Christian holydays, seem to regard this edict as merely one of the steps by which this Christian holyday, as others afterwards, received assistance and countenance from the state, by which, in fact, not a Divine and Apostolic ordinance, but a Church custom, was enabled to prevail in the world.

We are not, I think, bound to weigh too accurately the motives of Constantine. His position was no doubt a difficult one, both externally and internally. He had to deal with an empire in

which there was a great mixture of religions, though reducible for practical purposes to two denominations, Paganism and Christianity. He was more than half convinced of the insufficiency of Paganism, and nearly half convinced of the truth of Christianity. He dared not however offend the Pagans, much as he wished to encourage the Christians, to whom he had already granted toleration by the edict of Milan (A.D. 313). Was there any way in which he might advantage both, and yet confer a special though not obtrusive boon upon the latter? All his subjects, it is probable, felt the condition of the kalendar to be a crying and practical inconvenience like that of the old and new style in later times. And the division of his population into two classes was perpetuated by the existence of days for judicature, which one half of them, the heathen, considered to be Fasti, from the fact of their not being heathen festivals—the other half to be Nefasti, or days, to say the least, inconvenient for legal purposes, from the fact of their Christian Festivals being held upon them, and requiring cessation from worldly matters for their due celebration. To meet this state of things he selected for a day of rest for the whole Empire a day already, as we believe, regarded by the Christians as a Festival of Divine institution; calling it by its civil name, as one which the Christians were well acquainted with and did not scruple to employ, but which could

not offend the heathen as having nothing distinctively Christian in it. The Christians would accept it gladly. It was an evidence to them that the kingdoms of this world were becoming visibly, though the world knew it not, subservient to the Lord of the Day. The Pagans could not object to it. It produced uniformity in their Festivals and remedied various inconveniences which met them at every turn. As for the rural districts, where Paganism especially prevailed, these had an exception made in their favor, which obviated every pretence of hardship. Both Christians and Pagans,—the former as far as they could, and from their religious rites requiring their time, the latter altogether,—had been accustomed to Festival Rests; Constantine made these Rests to synchronize. His enactment then, though a political and politic one, was not Sabbatarian, or an advance towards Sabbatarianism; nor was it, on the other hand, a formal permission of labour to Christians which was not enjoyed before. It was such an assistance as the civil power, supposing it to be Christian, was bound to render to ordinances which Christians consider sacred; the care that public proceedings should be administered in such a manner as not to necessitate either submission to wrong on other days, or neglect of divine offices on the Lord's Day. It was, at the same time, all that the Emperor could then do. Eusebius well describes his

policy. It was "to effect the turning of mankind to God by gentle means" (*ἠρέμα σύμπαντας ἀνθρώπους θεοσεβεῖς ἀπεργάσασθαι*), and any more decided declaration would have defeated that policy. The suspension of heathen games on the Lord's Day, and the rendering the interdiction of labour general, might be taken up by his successors. He himself ventured upon something more afterwards. His enactment, I say, was not Sabbatarian. There is in it no reference to the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. There is in it no discouragement of the *εὐφροσύνη* or cheerfulness, with which the genius of Christianity would suggest that the day should be associated, and with which the testimony of the Fathers proves that it was associated. The willingness with which the Christians, who were mostly in the cities, submitted to the ordinance, is an evidence that rest from their ordinary labours on the day of their religious assemblies was no new thing to them. Thus public interdiction of such labours and of legal proceedings only gave sanction to a rest which probably, to their worldly detriment, they had already observed, or which (for there is reason for believing that the First Day of the week was a court day) they had, against their consciences, neglected to their spiritual detriment.

[When I say that Constantine afterwards ventured upon something more, I would not be understood to endorse the assertion sometimes

made, that he decreed an honour to Friday and Saturday, similar to that which he decreed to Sunday. ("Eusèbe affirme que Constantin avait ordonné qu'on honorât aussi le samedi, et Sozomène y joint même le vendredi," says Prince Albert de Broglie; but he adds very truly, "Rien de semblable ne se trouve dans les lois.") The Justinian and Theodosian codes are silent on this supposed supplemental ordinance. So far as Friday is concerned, it depends upon the testimony of Sozomen. (*τὴν δὲ Κυριακὴν καλουμένην ἡμέραν, ἣν Ἑβραιοι πρώτην τῆς ἑβδομάδος ὀνομάζουσιν, Ἕλληνες δὲ τῷ ἡλίῳ ἀνατιθέασιν, καὶ τὴν πρὸ τῆς ἑβδόμης ἐνομοθέτησε δικαστηρίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πραγμάτων σχολὴν ἄγειν πάντας, καὶ ἐν εὐχαῖς καὶ λιταῖς τὸ θεῖον θεραπεύειν· ἐτίμα δὲ τὴν Κυριακὴν, ὡς ἐν ταύτῃ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναστάντος ἐκ νεκρῶν· τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν, ὡς ἐν αὐτῇ σταυρωθέντος.*) As for Saturday, the passage in Eusebius is so manifestly corrupt, that unless we adopt the emendation of Valesius, (*τὴν πρὸ τοῦ Σαββάτου*, for *τὰς τοῦ Σαββάτου*,) we can make nothing of it; while, if we do thus amend it, it will speak of Friday, as that in Sozomen does, not of Saturday. (*καὶ ἡμέραν δὲ εὐχῶν ἡγεῖσθαι κατάλληλον, τὴν κυρίαν ἀληθῶς καὶ πρώτην ὄντως Κυριακήν τε καὶ σωτήριον διετύπου . . . . διὸ τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴν πολιτευομένοις ἅπασι, σχολὴν ἄγειν ταῖς ἐπωνύμοις τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμέραις ἐνουθέτει· ὁμοίως δὲ τὴν πρὸ τοῦ Σαββάτου* (corr. for *τὰς τοῦ Σ.*) *τιμᾶν· μνήμης ἕνεκά μοι δοκεῖν τῶν ἐν ταύταις τῷ κοινῷ Σωτῆρι πεπράχθαι μνημονευομένων.*) In whatever way the passage is

to be read, I would rather trust the Codes than statements which were probably suggested by confusion of current practice with imperial legislation. I have only alluded to them, because they are sometimes alleged in derogation of what I believe to be the fact, that Ἡ Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα was *the day* which would strike an inquirer as necessarily to be observed under Christianity. But to return.]

With every abatement for the state of things already existing, we may justly call the edict of Constantine the inauguration of a new era in the history of Lord's Day. Christians had now a document, and that not necessarily a Christian document, provided for the observance of a day which had heretofore been reverenced solely as an ordinance existing in and dating from the lifetime of the inspired Apostles. Men are always more inclined to lean on visible and living authorities, than on authorities past out of sight, however venerable: and, if both exist, to refer to the former rather than to the latter. And the former sort of authority having once established itself and having once felt its power, is inclined to extend it. So it was even in matters of the Church. The Lord's Day had, as a festival, hitherto stood almost alone in the Christian ritual (with the exception of Pentecoste, or the interval between the Resurrection and Whit-Sunday). But now, the Church seeing the Lord's Day so unreservedly recognised, began to establish other

Festivals, more or less resembling it, though destitute of the same sure foundation. These were multiplied, as time went on, in great abundance, and the aid of the state, so efficient in one case, as it seemed, was called in for other cases. And in order to justify this, by the time that the Reformation commenced, the following state of things, which may in a manner be called Sabbatarian, had completely set in. The Jewish law, or at least the supposed analogy of it, was continually and systematically quoted in favour of these multiplied Festivals. Exact and stringent rules had been laid down, professedly for the guidance of consciences, but really to their serious entanglement, in the observance of these Festivals. The results were, that the ideas of the Lord's Day and of the Sabbath, originally quite distinct, and indeed almost antagonistic, became confused; and that the reverence especially due to the Lord's Day was swamped amid claims to reverence on the part of other days, depending solely on Ecclesiastical authority in the lower sense of that phrase.

Some time (in fact, nearly two centuries) is yet to be traversed before this altered state of things becomes at all clearly visible. We will examine these two centuries together, taking as exponents of the Church's feeling and practice upon the subject, individual writers, councils, general or provincial, and such imperial edicts as bear more or less upon it, and are more

or less attributable to the influence of the Church.

At the commencement of the fourth century, A.D. 306, Lactantius, the Christian Cicero as he has been sometimes called, mentions the Sabbath. But it is with him not the Lord's Day, or even a type or precursor of the Lord's Day, but a type of the Millennium.

The Nicene Council, A.D. 325, speaks of the Lord's Day, but not as a thing newly invented, or which had had its title questioned. It only says that on that day and during Pentecoste (ἐν ταῖς τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ἡμέραις), persons are to pray standing—a custom more or less prevalent already.

Eusebius, the Ecclesiastical Historian, and Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, flourished A.D. 315. He mentions the Lord's Day as a festival well known even in Irenæus' time. He even makes the somewhat questionable assertion that the Apostles had an Easter Festival, and celebrated it on the Lord's Day. He says that Constantine "appointed for prayer that day which is really the first and chief of days, which is truly the Lord's Day, and a day of salvation." In another place he repeats his statement in the same words with some enlargements. Again, he eulogizes Constantine for commanding that "all should assemble together every week, and keep that day which is called the Lord's Day as a festival, to refresh even their bodies and to stir up

their minds by divine precepts and instruction." The Sabbath Eusebius speaks of in quite a different manner. "It was part of the legislation of Moses. Those before Moses ("Εβραιοι πρεσβύτεροι Μωσέως γενόμενοι τοῖς χρόνοις) were free from it and indeed from all accurately prescribed ordinances for devotion."

Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 326, in his treatise "De Sabbatis et de Circumcisione" (if indeed it be his), is most clear in enforcing the facts, that the Sabbath, the end of the Old Creation, has deceased, and that the Lord's Day, the commencement of the New Creation, has set in. According to his account, the very Sabbath itself was of a more spiritual character than is generally supposed. It was not instituted for the sake of mere inactivity, but with a view to knowledge of the Creator, and of rest from "the form of this creation," *i.e.* of rest from sin. In support of this mystical meaning, he urges that certain days not really Sabbaths receive the name of Sabbaths, because of the remission of sins and knowledge of God connected with them. And had literal rest (ἀργία) been its prime object, circumcision would scarcely have been permitted upon it, and the seven days' compassing of Jericho would have involved a serious violation of the law. Athanasius discovers an allusion to the Lord's Day in the title of the sixth Psalm, and one yet more evident in those words of the hundred

and eighteenth Psalm, v. 24: "This is the day which the Lord hath made." "What day can this be," (he asks) "but the resurrection day of the Lord—the day which brought salvation to all nations, the day on which the stone rejected by the builders became the head of the corner? The phrase signifies the resurrection day of our Saviour, which has received its name from Him to wit, the Lord's Day." In his Encyclical Letter, too, he speaks of certain Arians who had violated by their cruelties the Lord's Day, and converted it into a day of grief to the servants of Christ.

Some doubt has been thrown, as I have observed, on the genuineness of the treatise "De Sabbatis." Both the Benedictines and Fabricius class it amongst the questionable works of Athanasius. But, as the former qualify their somewhat hasty judgment by the words "Sanè quandam dignitatis speciem præfert hoc opusculum, ut si non Athanasii sit, alicujus saltem pii doctique viri opus esse putetur," and as the latter pronounces it "Athanasio fortasse haud indignum opusculum," I have ventured to quote it here. [Another work ascribed to Athanasius, and entitled Ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν σπόρον, or *De Semente*, I reject, for the reasons assigned by the Benedictines, without scruple. They speak most slightingly of it, and Fabricius has not a word to advance in its favour. I only mention it because of a peculiar phrase which is found

in it, and which has by some been interpreted as declaring that the Sabbath lives in the Lord's Day—*μετέθηκε δὲ ὁ Κύριος τὴν τοῦ Σαββάτου ἡμέραν εἰς Κυριακήν*. Even admitting, which we cannot, the treatise to be genuine, the words need mean, when taken with the context, no more than this, "The Sabbath, the shadow of things to come, is no more. The truth, and the Lord of truth, have been manifested, and are commemorated in the Lord's Day."]

Juvencus, a Spanish Presbyter, A.D. 345, in his metrical version of the Gospels, represents Christ as assuming to Himself power over all Sabbaths.

Macarius, a Presbyter of Upper Egypt, A.D. 350, spiritualizes the Sabbath, which he calls a purely Jewish institution, almost in the words of Justin Martyr. "It was a type and shadow of the true Sabbath given by the Lord to the soul." "The Lord when He came gave man the true and eternal Sabbath, and this is freedom from sin." "They who rest from sin, keep a true, delightsome and holy Sabbath" (*καὶ ἀργοῦσι ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας, σαββατίζουσαι σάββατον ἀληθινὸν, τρυφερὸν, ἅγιον*).

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 345, says in his Catechetical Lectures, "Turn thou not out of the way unto Samaritanism or Judaism. For Jesus Christ hath redeemed thee henceforth. Reject all observance of Sabbaths, and call not meats which are really matters of indifference, common or unclean."

Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers, A.D. 350, has a magnificent passage in his Tract on the ninety-second Psalm, which is headed, as you will recollect, "A Psalm or Song for the Sabbath day." He makes the whole of this life a preparation for the eternal Sabbath of the next, and adduces the analogy of the Jewish Law, under which all things were made ready for the "Sabbatum sæculare" on the day previous. In his general prolegomena to the Psalms he speaks as follows: "Cum in septimâ die Sabbati sit et nomen et observantia constituta, tamen nos in octavâ die, quæ et ipsa prima est, perfecti Sabbati felicitate lætamur." The Lord's Day is something better than, and beyond the Sabbath.

Epiphanius, Bishop of Constantia (formerly called Salamis), the chief city of Cyprus, A.D. 368, speaks of the Lord's Day as a Festival established by the Apostles. He attributes the same origin to the observance of Wednesday and Friday. And though he may be mistaken in this point, he may be admitted as an evidence of the distinction between the Lord's Day and the Sabbath. He is very clear in his statement that the latter is abolished. He calls it τὸ σάββατον τὸ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, τὸ μικρὸν σάββατον, as contrasted with the Great Sabbath, τὸ μεγὰ σάββατον, which is Christ Himself. The Sabbath was allegorical of rest from sin. Its strict rest was a matter of inferior importance. Christ Himself broke it—"My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

The compassing about of Jericho broke it. So did the sacrifices in the Temple, so did the act of circumcision. The Sabbath was made for man, not man for it. It was not ordained for interdictions, but for good works (*οὐ γέγονε γὰρ τὸ σάββατον εἰς ἀπόκλεισιν, ἀλλ' εἰς ἔργον ἀγαθόν*). Incidentally he gives us to understand that the Eastern Church had by this time begun to observe the Sabbath as a Festival, or at any rate not as a Fast. The heretic Marcion professed to fast upon it, in order to do despite to the God of the Jews. We, says Epiphanius, do not hold his doctrine or follow his example.

Our next authority is Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, A.D. 374. He frequently speaks of the Lord's Day as a Festival—those who fast upon it are as heretical as the Manichees. There are several passages in his works in which he elaborately contrasts the living and evangelical Lord's Day, with the defunct and legal Sabbath. In his oration "De Obitu Theodosii," he has a beautiful reference to the "Magnum Sabbatum" *i.e.* Christ, "the rest of the just." Occasionally he seems to call the Lord's Day a Sabbath, metaphorically, but he does not refer to the Fourth Commandment as the ground of its obligation. He mentions certain other Festivals.

Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, A.D. 372, speaks constantly of *Κυριακή*. Of *Σάββατον* he says that it was part of the old law, and to be classed with the other ordinances of that law, circumcision, distinctions

of meats, sacrifices and the like. The scope of all these was allegorical; in particular by the Sabbath is intimated rest from sinful works (*διὰ δὲ τοῦ σαββατισμοῦ τὴν ἐν τῷ κακῷ ἀπραξίαν διδάσκεται*). In one place in his works, which by the way evidently shows the spurious honor now beginning to be attributed to the Sabbath, he calls that and the Lord's Day, *ἀδελφαὶ ἡμέραι*. He probably means to allegorize them both, and to make the Sabbath a type of this life, the Lord's Day of the next, for he concludes with the words, *οὐδὲ ἐμμελῶς ποιῇ τῆς σαυτοῦ ἀθανασίας τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν*.

Gregory of Nazianzus, Bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 381, has a curious discussion on the qualities of the number Seven, and makes the fiftieth day, over and above the square of seven, in Pentecost, an emblem first of the Lord's Day, and then of the general Resurrection to which the Lord's Day looks forward. That day, he says, apostrophising his mother Nonna, who died suddenly while praying in church,

> *παντὸς σοὶ μύθοιο καὶ ἔργματος ἦεν ἔρεισμα*
> *Ἦμαρ Κυριακόν·*

but, as for the Sabbath, to reverence it is but to imitate the Hypsistarii, that strange composite sect of heretics, whose religion is made up of selections from Judaism and from Heathenism.

Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, A.D. 370, is very eloquent in his commendation of the

Lord's Day. It is the first, and yet the eighth day mentioned in certain titles of the Psalms. It sets forth the condition of things after this life ended, "the day never to be concluded, to have no evening, no successor, the life which shall never cease and never grow old." It is the day on which Christ rose, and on which we rose with Him. "On it," he says, "the Church prays standing." So she does throughout Pentecoste; and he speaks of "praying towards the East in recollection of Eden, as a very ancient tradition." We may question his authority for this assertion, and perhaps consider his account of *τὰ ἄγραφα τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυστήρια*, upon which he dwells a good deal, to be rather fanciful. Thus much however is clear, that in his time the Lord's Day had very definite associations, and those entirely belonging to the New Covenant, intimately connected with it.

Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia, A.D. 387, thus describes the first day, and contrasts it with the sixth day: "On the first day, the world began; on that same day, which became the Lord's Day, Christ renewed man, for whose sake He had made the world." "The sixth day was that on which man was formed, and on which also Christ suffered for man."

Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 398, writes thus: (I quote the Greek, because the terms are important) *καὶ τὸ ἔθος καὶ τὸ πρέπον ἡμᾶς ἀπαιτεῖ πᾶσαν κυριακὴν τιμᾶν καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ*

πανηγυρίζεσθαι, ἐπειδήπερ ἐν ταύτῃ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ἡμῶν ἐπρυτάνευσεν.

Jerom, the Presbyter, A.D. 392, elaborately contrasts Jewish and Christian ordinances. The Sabbath he places amongst the former, the Lord's Day amongst the latter. He is at great pains to defend Christian ordinances from the imputation of Judaism. His view is that Jewish rites were fixed and determinate. The Jews might not at all times or in all places, "immolare agnum, Pentecosten agere, tabernacula figere, jejunare quotidie," and the like. Christianity is not so bound. It is obvious that his argument proves too much, for the same method of spiritualizing which he liberally applies to Christianity, may be applied to Judaism. But it is possible that the apology appeared necessary in consequence of the great increase of holy days in the Church. Still his testimony to the positive observance of the Lord's Day is valuable. He describes the Egyptian *cœnobitæ*, as "employing themselves on that Day in nothing but prayer and reading the Scriptures." (Dominicis diebus orationi tantum et lectionibus vacant: quod quidem et omni tempore completis opusculis faciunt. Quotidie aliquid de Scripturis discitur.) Paula and her companions were diligent in daily devotions—they had six distinct hours in the twenty-four, in which they chanted the Psalter. (Mane—horâ tertiâ—sextâ—nonâ—vespere—

noctis medio Psalterium cantabant.) "But on the Lord's Day they went to Church" (Die tantum Dominico ad Ecclesiam procedebant, ex cujus habitabant latere.) Jerom does not, however, appear to have considered it indispensable to refrain on Sunday from all ordinary employments, for he subjoins, "On returning from Church, they would apply themselves to their allotted works, and make garments for themselves or others." (Inde revertentes instabant operi distributo, et vel sibi vel cæteris indumenta faciebant.) It is curious also to find the "Recluse of Bethlehem," who in his later days recalled so vividly, and lamented so bitterly the sins of his youth, mentioning without self-reproach one of what we should call his Sunday recreations. "Whilst I was at Rome, (says he), as a boy, pursuing my education, I frequently joined a party of similar ages and pursuits, in visits, on Sundays, to the sepulchres of the Apostles and Martyrs;" and then he goes to narrate how he penetrated into the catacombs, and depicts with taste and classical feeling his early impressions of the scene. And he introduces this, not as a subject of regret for "lavished hours and love mis-spent," but as a passing illustration of a passage of Scripture. (Dum essem Romæ puer, et liberalibus studiis erudirer, solebam cum cæteris ejusdem ætatis et propositi diebus Dominicis sepulchra Apostolorum et Martyrum circuire, crebro que cryptas ingredi, quæ in terrarum profunda defossæ ex

utrâque parte ingredientium per parietes habent corpora sepultorum, et ita obscura sunt omnia ut propemodum illud propheticum compleatur, 'Descendant ad infernum viventes,' (Psalm. lv. 16,) et raro desuper lumen admissum horrorem temperet tenebrarum, ut non tam fenestram quam foramen demissi luminis putes: rursum que pedetentim acceditur, et cæcâ nocte circumdatis illud Virgilianum proponitur,

"Horror ubique animos, simul ipsa silentia terrent."—*Æn.* 2.

With Jerom this was quite consistent with reverent regard for the institution. In other places he declares his opinion that the Law should be understood spiritually, not carnally, as the Jews too often understood it. We are not to be of the "sex diebus," *i.e.* we are not to be men of this world. We are to keep Sabbath in its true sense, by abstaining from sin. The precept "not to move out of our place on the Sabbath day" should not have been taken literally. "Turning away our foot from the Sabbath," and "bearing no burthen on the Sabbath," are each of them susceptible of an interpretation reaching far beyond the mere letter.

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo Regius in Africa, flourished A.D. 395. He spiritualizes the Jewish ordinances, and amongst them the Sabbath. "The Lord's Day and certain other days which he mentions are Christian institutions." "It is not, however, (as he apologetically remarks,) that we observe the times, but what is signified

by the times. The ordinances of the Old Covenant were the burdens of slaves, those of the New Covenant are the glory of children." No doubt he felt the difficulty of maintaining the distinctive character of Christianity, now that holy days were become very numerous, which we have already seen was felt by Jerom. There are many places, however, in his works in which he asserts the primitive observance of the Lord's Day, and its connexion with the Resurrection; as for instance, "Dies tamen Dominicus non Judæis sed Christianis resurrectione Domini declaratus est, et ex illo habere cœpit festivitatem suam." "To fast on the Sabbath (he says) may be excused . . . but to fast on the Lord's Day is a grave scandal, especially since the appearance of that detestable heresy, Manicheism, which is decidedly opposed to the Catholic Faith and the Divine Scriptures. Its professors have in a way appointed it to their disciples as the regular day for fasting, and this fact makes it the more horrible to fast on that day." [One passage he has, in which, after urging the Scriptural and Apostolical character of the Lord's Day, and its connexion with the resurrection of Christ, he goes on, though the sequence is scarcely apparent, to speak thus: "Ac ideo sancti Doctores Ecclesiæ decreverunt omnem gloriam Judaici Sabbatismi in illum, viz. Diem Dominicum transferre, ut quod ipsi in figurâ, nos celebraremus in veritate . . . sequestrati ab omni rurali opere, et

59069

ab omni negotio soli divino cultui vacemus." The genuineness of the treatise, "De Tempore," from whence it is extracted has been much questioned. If not genuine, we need not concern ourselves about it. If genuine, it may be interpreted in the same manner as the passage from the "De Semente" ascribed to Athanasius.]

I have delayed till now the consideration of the remarkable document called the "Apostolical Constitutions." It is impossible, for many reasons, to suppose that it was written by Clemens Romanus. And its whole tone, and its preceptive manner, and the state of things to which it alludes, make the notion of its being even an ante-Nicene collection very questionable. It is probably to be relegated to the latter part of the Fourth or the earlier part of the Fifth Century. But it is valuable for the following reasons. It shows that the Lord's Day was held in high and indeed in increasing honor, at the time it was written, and that it was not in any way identified with the Sabbath; and it furnishes a step in the history of the Lord's Day. It evidences incidentally, first, in what degree its singularity as *the* Scriptural Christian Festival had begun to be obscured by the appointment of Festivals coordinate with it, though emanating from an inferior authority; and secondly, to what extent the liberty in which the termination of the Third Century had left it, was becoming circumscribed. Here are some

of its expressions. "He that fasts on the Lord's Day is guilty of sin." "Keep as Festivals the Sabbath and the Lord's Day." "Every Sabbath, except the one, (*i.e.* the Great Sabbath during which the Lord lay in the grave,) and every Lord's Day, make your assemblies and rejoice." "Let the servants work five days, but cease from labour and be at church on the Sabbath and on the Lord's Day, that they may be taught religion." "Assemble yourselves, especially on the Sabbath Day, and on the day on which the Lord rose, the Lord's Day." The formal respect paid to the Sabbath in this document may in part be accounted for by the fact mentioned above, that the Eastern Church (to whose customs the book of "Constitutions" especially refers) desired to discountenance the heresy of Marcion. But, with every abatement, when I find such multiplied days, and such minute regulations concerning them, and such injunctions to absolute rest upon them, as appear therein, I cannot but consider the document in which they appear to be an evidence that a taste for Judaism had in many respects insinuated itself into the Church by the time that it was set forth.

I have spoken in several places of Judaism intruding itself into the Church. I mean by the word, both Judaism as it originally existed, which though intended to exist under the Old Dispensation, was utterly out of place under the New, and the over-strained or Pharisaical Judaism

rebuked by our Lord, which was never intended to exist at all. It is curious, however, to find the Fathers of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries, when *these two* sorts of Judaism were most to be feared, directing their energies against a *third sort* of Judaism of a very different character. The Jews of those ages seem to have reverted to the days of the Prophets in their employment of their rest on Sabbaths, New Moons, and other National Festivals. Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret and Prudentius, with one voice accuse them of spending these days not merely in worldliness, but in licentiousness. Whatever charges Hosea, or Amos, or Isaiah, or Ezekiel had brought against them of old, these writers declare to be applicable to them at that hour. Hence, in all probability, the contemporary proverbial expression, "Luxus Sabbatarius," which is found in Sidonius. And hence also the variety of contemptuous meanings with which in later times the word "Sabbat" is associated on the Continent of Europe.

Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 398; Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 412; Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, who flourished in the reign of Theodosius the Younger, A.D. 408—450, and were continuators of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, will almost complete the list which we proposed.

Chrysostom extracts a spiritual meaning from the ordinances of the Jewish Law. He solemnly

warns Christians against Sabbatizing with the Jews, and refers to 1 Cor. xvi. 2 as sanctioning the Lord's Day. In his own eloquent manner, too, he speaks of St. Paul's preaching on the Lord's Day at Troas. He desires some of his hearers not to hesitate to come to a second *σύναξις* on that day, even after the hour of refection (*μετὰ τὴν ἑστίασιν*). At the same time he warns them that Christian ordinances, as well as those of the Jews, admit of a spiritual interpretation. He has a very remarkable passage in his Commentary on Genesis, c. 1 (the first I think of the kind which is to be found in the Fathers), in which he refers to God's words at the beginning, as in a figure exhibiting our duty of consecrating the first day in the week to Him. (*Ἐντεῦθεν ἐκ προοιμίων αἰνιγματωδῶς διδασκαλίαν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς παρέχεται, παιδεύων τὴν μίαν ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἅπασαν ἀνατιθέναι καὶ ἀφορίζειν τῇ τῶν πνευματικῶν ἐργασίᾳ.*) Considered dogmatically, this passage, by the words *αἰνιγματωδῶς* and *ἅπασαν*, shows that a sort of change has come over the patristic treatment of the Lord's Day. (Though it is to be observed that Chrysostom does not say *μίαν* in the seven, but *τὴν μίαν* in the seven.) I think, however, that we gather necessarily from it no more than this, that the Lord's Day was conceived by him to have an analogy to something in the Jewish Law, and to come under the general head of foreseen and ordained Rest.

Cyril of Alexandria is clear as to the spiritual and allegorical character of the Sabbath. But it had other and immediately practical uses. The Jews were prone to the worship of the Sun and of the heavenly bodies. But by this weekly rest they were reminded of the Great Creator and Artificer, whose servants indeed all these things were. The Sabbath, as an observance, is now abolished. The First Day of the week, on which Christ rose and we with Him rise to newness of life, is to be honored.

Theodoret condemns the Ebionites for joining the observance of the Sabbath after the law of the Jews, with that of the Lord's Day after the manner of Christians. This passage is worth notice, because it shows that whatever regard the Christians paid to the Sabbath in Theodoret's day, it was not such a regard as the Jews paid to it; and besides, it clearly contrasts the Christian way in which the Lord's Day was hallowed with the Jewish way of hallowing the Sabbath. The Sabbath was not an institution of nature, but a matter of positive precept. It was an ordinance peculiar to the Jews. It had its moral and political uses. It was an inducement to humanity—a bond of union—a sign between God and His people—a peculiarity in legislation likely to attach the people to their legislator.

Another of the continuators of Eusebius, Socrates, has an expression occurring incidentally,

in which the Sabbath and the Lord's Day are both mentioned as weekly Festivals on which *συνάξεις* were usually held: *ἡνίκα ἑκάστης ἑβδομάδος ὁρταὶ κατελάμβανον, φημὶ δὴ τό τε Σάββατον καὶ ἡ Κυριακὴ, ἐν αἷς αἱ συνάξεις κατὰ τὰς ἐκκλησίας εἰώθασι γενέσθαι.* And a third continuator, Sozomen, intimates, in a passage already quoted, that what Constantine did for the First Day of the week was not to make it the Lord's Day, but to render it an authorized holiday. Suicer observes upon his language, "Non dicit a Constantino appellatam *Κυριακὴν*, sed, 'jam ante sic vocatam, feriatam esse decrevit.'" Of course you will have noticed in both these historians the dignity, unknown to the early Church, attached in one case to the Saturday and in the other to the Friday. A chapter in Socrates (V. 22) is sometimes referred to in proof that the Lord's Day is purely of ecclesiastical institution. But he is obviously arguing against the apostolical origin of such Feasts and Fasts as Easter and Lent, and of certain observances connected with them. The Lord's Day is mentioned in the passage, but no question is raised about it.

I might, as you are aware, quote various other writers within the period which I have assigned to myself, Cœlius Sedulius, for instance, a Presbyter towards the end of the fifth century. He speaks thus of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day:—

> Cœperat interea post tristia Sabbata felix
> Irradiare dies, culmen qui nominis alti

A Domino dominante trahit, primusque videre
Promeruit nasci mundum, atque resurgere Christum.
Septima nam Genesis cum dicit Sabbata, claret
Hunc orbis caput esse diem, quem gloria regis
Nunc etiam proprii donans fulgore tropæi,
Primatum retinere dedit.

But I pass on to consider what notice was taken of the Sabbath and of the Lord's Day respectively during the two centuries with which we have been engaged, by Provincial Councils of the Church. I have already stated what was said of it by the only General Council which touched upon it, the Council of Nicæa.

The Council of Eliberis, A.D. 305, very strenuously promotes religious worship on the Lord's Day, and threatens suspension from communion to any person living in a town who shall absent himself for three Lord's Days from church. The Council of Gangra (the date of which is doubtful, but which took place between A.D. 320—370) condemns those who make the Lord's Day a day of fasting (as being no Catholics, and savouring of the heresy of the Manichees), and also those who despise the House of God and frequent schismatical assemblies. The Council of Sardica, about A.D. 345, repeats the language of that of Eliberis, mentioned already. And a Canon passed by the Council of Antioch, A.D. 340, was to the effect that, "If any one came to church to hear the Scriptures read and the sermon preached, but refused to join in the prayers or the reception of the Holy Eucharist, (which

was then administered every Lord's Day,) he was to be excommunicated and reduced to the state of a penitent, as one who had brought confusion and disorder into the Church." The First Council of Toledo, A.D. 400, enforced the same point. The Fourth Council of Carthage, A.D. 436, added that "If any one left the church while the 'Sacerdos' was preaching, he was to be excommunicated." The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 363 or thereabouts, speaks in the following terms: *ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς Ἰουδαΐζειν, καὶ ἐν τῷ Σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, τὴν δὲ Κυριακὴν προτιμῶντες, εἴγε δύναιντο, σχολάζειν ὡς Χριστιανοί· εἰ δὲ εὑρεθεῖεν Ἰουδαΐσταὶ, ἔστωσαν ἀνάθεμα παρὰ Χριστῷ.* The meaning of this Canon, which I have purposely quoted in the original, has been much disputed; but it seems to me to be tolerably clear. All Judaizing is forbidden, whether such as keeps the Sabbath by making it a day of *σχολὴ*, or such as keeps the Lord's Day by observing a sort of Judaic *σχολὴ* upon it. There is, however, a Christian *σχολὴ* which is appropriate to the Lord's Day; let this be observed by all means, only let its distinctiveness, as a Christian one, be carefully kept in view. The Fourth Council of Carthage discouraged going to Games or into the Public Circus on the Lord's Day. At the same time it repeated the condemnation given by the Council of Gangra to asceticism upon it.

But let me now turn, as I proposed, to inquire what language the Civil power has held respect-

ing the Lord's Day since the date of Constantine's edict. Eusebius mentions a law by which he enjoined the Christian section of his army to rest on the Lord's Day from military exercises, and to repair with all diligence to divine worship. By another law he is said to have desired even his pagan soldiery to lay aside their arms on that day, and repair to the fields, where they were to offer up a prayer composed by himself to the Supreme King of all. About sixty years later, the transaction of business (negotiorum intentio) was forbidden by Theodosius the Great, A. D. 386, who, in the words of Canon Robertson, also "abolished the spectacles in which the heathen had found their consolation when the day had been set apart from other secular uses by Constantine." Theodosius the younger, A. D. 425, in legislating on the subject, stated, that the honors due to the Emperor were less important than the observance of the Lord's Day, and of certain sacred seasons which he specifies. Leo and Anthemius, A.D. 469, held yet stronger language. If the Emperor's birthday fell on that day, the acknowledgment of it which was accompanied by Games was to be put off. It does not however appear that the Christians, now greatly increased in number, so much objected to the Emperors that all relaxation on the Lord's Day was unlawful, but that these *Games*, being idolatrous, indecent, and cruel, and so unfit for a Christian to attend on any day, were especially

unfit to engage his thoughts or attract his attention on the Lord's Day. In particular, the weaker brethren were likely to be led away by them. The very words of the law of these Emperors show what kinds of amusements were interdicted:—"Nec hujus tamen religiosi diei otia relaxantes, obscœnis quemquam patimur voluptatibus detineri. Nihil eodem die sibi vindicet scena theatralis, aut circense spectaculum, aut ferarum lacrimosa spectacula: et si in nostrum ortum aut natalem celebranda solennitas inciderit, differatur."

A few notices as to legal proceedings may conclude this portion of our subject. Constantine qualified his general prohibition of law business on the Lord's Day, by soon afterwards permitting the acts of conferring liberty and legal rights (*manumissio*, for instance, or giving freedom to the slave, and *emancipatio*, or setting the son free from the paternal power). This law was followed, under Valentinian and Valens, A.D. 368, by one prohibiting the exacting on that day, from any Christian, the payment of any debt. And both enactments were repeated in the succeeding reign, A.D. 386, with the additional prohibition of trials before arbitrators, even though deriving their authority from the assent of the parties; and with the declaration that violation of the sacred rites of religion should be considered not only infamous but sacrilegious "on the day of the Sun, which our fathers rightly named the Lord's

Day." Theodosius the Great confirmed all this, but made his prohibition include not merely the "Dies Solis qui repetito in se calculo revolvuntur," but such a number of other days as to constitute one hundred and twenty-four judicial holidays in the course of the year. This was in A.D. 389. And the law of Leo and Anthemius, quoted already, speaks thus earnestly and even eloquently on the subject. "The Lord's Day," thus it runs, "we decree to be ever so honored and revered, that it should be exempt from all compulsory process: let no summons urge any man; let no one be required to give security for the payment of a fund held by him in trust; let the serjeants of the courts be silent; let the pleader cease his labours; let that day be a stranger to trials; be the crier's voice unheard; let the litigants have breathing time and an interval of truce; let the rival disputants have an opportunity of meeting without fear; of comparing the arrangements made in their names and arranging the terms of a compromise. If any officer of the courts, under pretence of public or private business, dares to despise these enactments, let his patrimony be forfeited."

And now what is the result of our inquiries into the state of feeling and practice in reference to the Lord's Day, since the conclusion of the Third Century? A great tendency to multiplication of days and observances has manifested itself. The Sabbath has raised its head again,

though in a diverse manner, both in the East and in the West. Christians have found themselves compelled to apologize for the multitude of their Festivals, and while, on the one hand, they sometimes defend themselves from the charge of Judaizing by nice distinctions between observing *the times* and observing *what is signified by the times*, on the other they occasionally resort to the analogy of the Jewish law, or if not that to the authority of the Church purely. They thus incur the twofold hazard (especially when the Sabbath dies out again, as it soon does) of forgetting that the Lord's Day is a New Testament ordinance distinct from the Sabbath, and that the antiquity and Apostolicity of it place it above all purely Ecclesiastical ordinances. (So, if I may venture upon an illustration drawn from a parallel case, the Church of Rome, of her own authority, has mixed up with the degrees of consanguinity and affinity within which marriage is forbidden in Scripture, other degrees not so forbidden, and called all alike mere Ecclesiastical prohibitions.) Insensibly, in part from dependence upon secular aid and imitation of secular legislation, (which must be universal in its terms and stringent in the enforcement of its commands,) and in part from the profession of Christianity being now attended with no danger; rest, though emphatically a Christian rest, is beginning to be insisted upon, attendance at Divine worship, heretofore a service of love, is

enforced by Ecclesiastical penalties, and frequenting of irregular assemblies is discouraged in a similar manner. It has been found necessary to forbid Christians to appear at heathen public games, so long as they are allowed, on the Lord's Day. And the Civil power has consented to close the law courts, and forbidden, at any rate in towns, a man's public pursuit of his calling; it has at length put down the scandal of such games as were offensive and a snare to Christians, on that day. In all these respects a certain change is observable, and therefore I call these two centuries the commencement of a new era in the history of the Lord's Day. But with all this, in no clearly genuine passage that I can discover in any writer of these two centuries, or in any public document Ecclesiastical or Civil, is the Fourth Commandment referred to as the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's Day. In no passage, too, is there anything like a reference to the Creation words, as the ground of the obligation to observe it, with the exception perhaps of that one passage in Chrysostom in which the command for the seventh day is made *αἰνιγματωδῶς* to shadow forth the command for the first. In no passage is there anything like the confusion between "the seventh day," and "one day in seven," of which we have heard so much in England since A.D. 1595. In no passage is there any hint of the transfer of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day, or of the planting

of the Lord's Day on the ruins of the Sabbath, those fictions of modern times. If the Sabbath appears, it appears as a perfectly distinct day. And what is still more to our purpose, looking at the matter as a practical one, though law proceedings are forbidden, and labours for gain (at any rate in towns) are forbidden, and amusements unseemly for a Christian on any day are forbidden, no symptom is as yet discoverable of compulsory restrictions of, or conscientious abstinence from such recreations and necessary duties (other than trades and professions) as are permissible on other days, so long as they do not interfere with Divine worship, and the things connected with it, and appropriate to the Lord's Day. It seems to have been still assumed that the religious character of the day, its institution as the Lord's Day, (and that Lord, the Son of Man,) once admitted, and guarded as we have seen it guarded, not merely would Praise and Bounty be rendered to God, but its Rest be enjoyed harmlessly. The day is not to be a Fast, for it is a day of Joy: the Church has always considered it to be a day of Joy, and none but heretics have thought otherwise of it. In fact, we may at least say, that though to a certain extent formalized, and to a certain extent divested of its unique claims to the Christian's regard, the Lord's Day at the end of the Fifth Century is not transformed into anything like the Sabbath as the Jews had it.

But a more serious change is at hand. In the centuries ranging from the Sixth to the Fifteenth, we find Civil Rulers and Councils, and Ecclesiastical writers by degrees altering their tone. Holydays are multiplied more and more. Then, as the Church has established so many that it is impossible to observe them all, and as her authority, from being exercised so often and in a manner so difficult to be complied with, begins to be thought lightly of, holy days must be distinguished, and some sanction which shall vividly reach the conscience must be found for days of special obligation. The Old Testament has been already referred to for the analogy of many of her Festivals. The step from analogy to identification is not a startling or a violent one. Thus a gradual identification of the Lord's Day with the Sabbath sets in. This naturally leads to the Fourth Commandment. The Fourth Commandment once thought of, vexatious restrictions follow, thwarting men in their necessary employments or enjoyments by an application of its terms either strictly literal or most ingeniously refined. Councils condescend to notice whether "oxen may or may not be yoked on the Lord's Day," and not unfrequently contradict each other. The Second Council of Macon, A.D. 585, enjoins, "that no one should allow himself on the Lord's Day, under plea of necessity, to put a yoke on the necks of his cattle; but all be occupied with mind and body in the hymns

and the praise of God. For this is the day of perpetual rest; this is shadowed out to us by the seventh day in the law and the prophets." It then goes on to threaten punishments for profanation of the holy day either by pleading causes or by other works. Offenders will displease God, and besides will draw upon themselves the "implacable anger of the clergy." Lawyers will lose their privilege of pleading causes; clerks or monks will be shut out for six months from the society of their brethren; "Rusticus aut servus gravioribus fustium ictibus verberabitur." Still, even in this Council, there is a recognition of the true origin of the Lord's Day, "Keep the Lord's Day, whereon we were born anew, and freed from all sins."

Things go on much in this way. Clothaire, King of France, issues an edict prohibiting all servile labours on the Lord's Day, assigning as a reason, "Quia lex prohibet et sacra scriptura in omnibus contradicit." A synod held at Friuli, A.D. 791, under Pepin King of France, makes a remarkable canon in reference to it,—"Etiam a propriis conjugibus, &c." which savours very strongly of Judaism. In the early part of the ninth century, in two councils, held, the one at Mayence, and the other at Rheims, in the reign of Charlemagne, canons are made against doing servile work on the Lord's Day, which is directed by the former council to be held in all reverence; whilst the latter, grounding its pro-

hibition on "the precept of the Lord," proceeds also to prohibit public largesses on that day. The Lord's Day is embodied in the capitularies of the Frank emperors; and its observance is enforced by severe penalties, which we find specified in another law of the same code to this effect:—"To yoke a pair of oxen to a cart and walk by the side of it on the Lord's Day, shall involve the loss of the right ox; to do other servile acts, prohibited by Canonical authority, shall render the offender liable to pay a fine to the clergy, and also to perform whatever penalty they may impose, according to the nature of the offence;" and "the judges are directed to aid the clergy and enforce obedience to their mandates." The language under Charlemagne's direction is singularly like that of Clothaire—"Secundum id quod Dominus in lege præcepit," and no doubt involved a similar dependence on the Fourth Commandment, taken literally.

In the East, the exemption granted to agricultural labours by Constantine, which had been embodied in the code of Justinian, was repealed by the Emperor Leo Philosophus, A.D. 910, who animadverted in somewhat severe terms on the law of his great predecessor.

A great variety of restrictive injunctions were issued in England from the seventh to the twelfth century, of which I can only notice a few. Ina, King of the West Saxons, A.D. 673, and the Council of Berkhampstead, A.D. 697, forbade

all work on the Lord's Day, under penalties strangely and almost fantastically graduated. So did the Constitutions of Egbert, Archbishop of York, A.D. 749, and the Convention between Edward the Elder and Guthrun the Dane, A.D. 906. The Council of Clovishoff, A.D. 747, forbade travelling; a law of Athelstane, A.D. 925, trading; and in a law of Edgar the Peaceable, A.D. 958, we find that the Lord's Day is to commence at "three o'clock in the afternoon on Saturday, and to last until the dawn of Monday." It would be tedious to mention the number of holy days for which similar reverence is demanded, or the vexatious enactments relating to them. It may suffice to say that a Judaic and almost more than Judaic strictness was introduced, both into them and into the Lord's Day, under the sanction of Church authority, and that generally it was a greater crime to do wrong on a Festival than on an ordinary day.

A few more instances, taken almost at random, may conclude this part of our subject. At the end of the eighth century, we find Alcuin asserting, that "the observation of the former Sabbath had been transferred very fitly to the Lord's Day, by the custom and consent of Christian people." In the twelfth century, Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaulx, grounds the Lord's Day and the other Holy Days on the Fourth Commandment. "Spirituale obsequium Deo præbetur in observantiâ sanctarum solemni-

tatum, unde tertium (quartum) præceptum contexitur." Petrus Alphonsus, in the same century, has the expression, "Christian Sabbath" (Heylin asserts that it is first found in his works); "Dies Dominica, dies, viz. resurrectionis, quæ suæ salvationis causâ exstitit, Christianorum Sabbatum est." In England again, A.D. 1201, in the time of King John, Eustace, Abbot of Flay, preaches the observance of the Lord's Day with a strictness eminently Judaical, and descending to the most ordinary occupations. He professes to confirm his doctrine by a letter, purporting to be from our Saviour, and miraculously found on the altar of St. Simeon at Golgotha. Various apocryphal judgments overtook persons transgressing in the slightest degree the commands set forth in this document. It had said, that from the ninth hour of the Sabbath, (Saturday) to sunrise on Monday, no work was to be done: and it is curious to find that the instances of punishment seem to cluster about the profanation of the later hours of Saturday. At length the Church, almost as a rule, though still asserting that the Lord's Day, and all other Holy Days, were of Ecclesiastical institution (not indeed in the high sense of that word, for they are not *de Jure Divino*, but *de Jure Humano Canonico*), had erected a complete Judaic superstructure upon an Ecclesiastical foundation. Thomas Aquinas (in the thirteenth century), says Heylin, fits every legal Festival with some that were observed in

the Christian Church, on the ground that ours are observed in the place of theirs. "Sabbatum mutatur in diem Dominicum, similiter aliis solennitatibus veteris legis novæ solennitates succedunt." "Bellarmine (says Mr. Baden Powell) afterwards maintained that the distinction of days and festivals was not taken away, but changed by the Christian Church; which, as being infallible, had doubtless power to make such change in divine institutions; though otherwise it manifestly had not." And Archbishop Chichele, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, in his desire to prevent barbers and other persons from exercising their callings on the morning of the Lord's Day, actually confuses that day with "the seventh day, which the Lord blessed, which He sanctified, and in which, after the works of the six days, He rested from His work." His words are, "Die Dominico, videlicet, die Septimo."

The most perfect development, however, of this ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism is displayed by Tostatus, Bishop of Avila, in the fourteenth century, in his Commentary on the twelfth chapter of Exodus. He proceeds there to lay down a series of ordinances minutely regulating its observance, and I fear bringing him under the words of St. Paul, "If I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor." I mention a very few of them, and those by no means the most vexatious, with

two objects;—first, that you may compare the state of the Lord's Day (I mean the theoretical state of it), at the end of this period, with what you have seen of it in Scripture, and at the end of the third, or even at the end of the fifth century. Secondly, that I may exhibit the identity of this sort of Sabbatarianism, with the Pharisaism apparent in the Jews of the New Testament, and developed in the Talmud, with the Puritan doctrine concerning Sunday, and with the practice obtaining in Scotland. Of this, however, bye and bye.

"If a musician (says Tostatus) wait upon a gentleman, to recreate his mind with music, and they are agreed upon certain wages, or he be only hired for a present time, he sins in case he play or sing to him on Holy Days (including the Lord's Day), but not if his reward be doubtful or depend only on the bounty of the parties who enjoy his music." "A cook that on the Holy Days is hired to make a feast or to dress a dinner, commits a mortal sin; but not if he be hired by the month or year." "Meat may be dressed upon the Lord's Day or the other Holy Days, but to wash dishes on those days, is unlawful—*that* must be deferred to another day." "A man that travels on Holy Days, to any special shrine or saint, commits no sin, but he commits sin if he returns home on those days." "Artificers which work on these days for their own profit only, are in mortal sin,

unless the work be very small (quia modicum non facit solennitatem dissolvi), because a small thing dishonoreth not the Festival." But I forbear to proceed with this catalogue of puerilities. I should not have touched upon it at all, except for the reasons which I have already mentioned.

Of course, as the dates will have shown, all this did not come in at once; and it did not come in at all without remonstrance. Clear eyes, and faithful hearts, and well-stored minds, and vigorous pens were to be found, even in this superstitious period. The third Council of Orleans, A.D. 538, though recommending abstinence from rural labours, considers that positive and precise ordinances on such subjects "as travelling, or preparing anything for food, or doing anything conducive to the cleanliness of houses or men on the Lord's Day, belong rather to Jewish than to Christian observances." At the commencement of the seventh century, Gregory the First wrote against Sabbatarianism (his language is strong, for he perceived, that clear-sighted man, that the tendency against which he directed it admitted of no compromise); and yet, as you will see from his concluding words, he was not deficient in recognising the religious character of the Lord's Day. "Antichristus veniens diem Sabbatum atque Dominicum ab omni faciet opere custodiri." "Nos, quod de Sabbato scriptum est, spiritualiter accipimus,

spiritualiter tenemus. Sabbatum enim requies dicitur. Verum autem Sabbatum ipsum Redemptorem nostrum Jesum Christum Dominum habemus, et qui lucem fidei ejus agnoscit, si peccata concupiscentiæ ad mentem per oculos trahit, in die Sabbati onera per portas introducit. Aliud quoque ad nos perlatum est, vobis a perversis hominibus esse prædicatum, ut Dominico die nullus debeat lavari. Et quidem, si pro luxu animi et voluptatis quis lavari appetit, hoc fieri nec reliquo die concedimus. Si autem pro necessitate corporis, hoc nec Dominico die prohibemus. Scriptum namque est; 'Nemo carnem suam odio habuit, sed nutrit et fovet eam.' Si Dominico die corpus lavare peccatum est, lavari ergo die eodem nec facies debet. Dominico verò die a labore terreno cessandum est, atque omnimodo orationibus insistendum, ut si quid negligentiæ per sex dies agitur, per diem resurrectionis precibus expietur." Thus far Pope Gregory. Theodulphus, Bishop of Orleans (in the eighth century), urged, in language recalling an earlier period, the claims of the Lord's Day to regard on anything but Jewish grounds. "Since in it God created the light; in it He rained down manna in the wilderness; in it the Redeemer of the human race, who of His own will died for our salvation, rose again from the dead; in it He poured out the Holy Spirit on His disciples, such ought to be our reverence for it, that nothing should be performed but

prayers and the solemnities of the mass, and what is connected with the preparation of food; and if there be occasion for sailing or travelling, and license is given, it should be under the condition that the attendance on mass and prayers should not be omitted if there be opportunity." He goes on indeed to exact what neither Scripture nor the Fathers appear to exact, the spiritual employment of the entire day. But I quote his words as not misstating the origin of the Lord's Day, or confounding it in theory with the Sabbath. Pope Nicholas the First (in the ninth century) was so far from having a Judaic view of the Lord's Day, as to justify even war, in case of necessity, during its continuance, by the precedents of the assault on Jericho, which he supposes to have taken place on the Sabbath day, and by the conduct of the Maccabees. "The Christians do not place their hope in days, but look for their salvation in the living and true God alone." Even the Emperor Leo Philosophus, who, as we have seen, forbade rural labours on the Lord's Day, does so on the ground that "it pleased the Holy Ghost and the Apostles ordained by Him, that all on this sacred day, wherein we were restored to our immortal nature, should abstain from labour." And he goes on to argue, that "if the Jews honored the Sabbath, *à fortiori* should Christians honor that Day which God has chosen for His service." And various Churchmen and Synods at different times and places

set themselves to stem the torrent of Judaism which was flowing into the Church. Archbishop Islip of Canterbury, in the fourteenth century, while enjoining "abstinence from secular works, even though useful to the State, on the sacred day of the Lord," gives a caution that men do not "meet before the hour of vespers on the Sabbath," or Saturday, "lest we seem to partake in the Jewish profession." And so a Synod assembled at York under Neville, the Archbishop of that see, A.D. 1466, set forth an exposition of the Decalogue as a guide for the clergy in their addresses to the people. Passages occur in this document in reference to the Third (Fourth) Commandment to the following effect. "It is said, 'Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day.' By this the observance of the Christian worship is enjoined, which is of obligation alike on the clergy and laity. But it is to be known here, that the obligation to keep holyday on the legal Sabbath, according to the form of the Old Testament, wholly expired with the other ceremonies of the law. And that under the New Testament it is sufficient to keep holyday for the Divine worship on the Lord's Days, and the other solemn days ordained to be kept as holydays by the authority of the Church; wherein the manner of keeping holyday is to be taken, not from the Jewish superstition, but from the directions of the Canons." I do not of course quote this as speaking of the

Lord's Day, after the ante-Nicene manner, but it is, as far as it goes, a valuable disclaimer of Sabbatarianism as a practical tenet. Its Ecclesiasticism, in reference to other solemn days, will not have escaped your notice.

There were those also who were goaded, by finding too much imposed upon them, to reject everything in the shape of Fast and Festival (a reaction very natural). Peter de Bruys, for instance, who founded the ephemeral sect called Petrobrussians in the regions of the Pyrenees, A.D. 1110, was a remarkable instance of this. His views in reference to ordinances appear to have resembled those held by certain Anabaptists long afterwards, and were propagated with similar violence. The Waldenses, at the close of the Thirteenth Century, disparaged all distinction of days. "Quod unus dies sit sicut alius," was their maxim in this matter. The Lollards, at the beginning of the Fourteenth Century, entertained a strong antipathy to Saints' Days, and extended it even to the weekly Festival of the Resurrection. No doubt these were irregular and eccentric protests, but the abuses in reference to the Lord's Day and to other matters, which gave rise to them, and the fact that the more elaborate and complicated Ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism became in theory, the more religion was practically disregarded, and the Lord's Day perverted to unholy uses, were among the causes that provoked in due time that more systematic and general movement, the Reformation.

This important event, found, as we have said, the Lord's Day obscured by a sort of Sabbatarianism established on an Ecclesiastical foundation. It purified it from this, and in England, proceeded, authoritatively at least, no further. On the Continent, so far as the movement extended, it did something more. This however I shall hope to discuss hereafter. But the Fourth and Fifth Lectures will be devoted to an examination into the origin and nature of the Sabbath, and its connexion, if any, with the Lord's Day. This digression is the more necessary, because I believe that we shall discover, as we proceed, that a good deal of what is called Sabbatarianism has been founded, not on the institution itself as Moses bequeathed it to his people, but on corrupt forms of it, existing in our Lord's time, and persisted in by the later Jews.

LECTURE IV

COLOSSIANS II. 16, 17.

LET NO MAN THEREFORE JUDGE YOU IN MEAT OR IN DRINK, OR IN RESPECT OF AN HOLY-DAY, OR OF THE NEW MOON, OR OF THE SABBATH DAYS, WHICH ARE A SHADOW OF THINGS TO COME: BUT THE BODY IS OF CHRIST.

Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει ἢ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νουμηνίας ἢ σαββάτων,
Ἅ ἐστιν σκια τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

THAT the Lord's Day is a positive ordinance of Scriptural and Apostolic Christianity, standing on grounds, and supported by considerations, peculiarly its own, and not borrowed or continued from the older Dispensation—that the Sabbath was not held to be of obligation upon Christians, so far as the Apostles and the early Church may be cited as authorities—and that attempts to regulate the Lord's Day by the exactness of the precedent of the Sabbath, or to found it primarily on the command given to the Jews for the establishment of the Sabbath, seem therefore to be a rebuilding of things which have been destroyed, and to make those who do so transgressors—has been the argument of the previous Lectures. There are,

however, two points in respect of which it is as yet by no means complete. We have to show how Sabbatarianism developed itself in the post-Reformation, as well as in the ante-Reformation Church. This is one point, but it may stand over for the present. The other point is, a full elucidation of the nature of the Sabbath. Its history subsequent to our Lord's Resurrection has been treated, though incidentally, with sufficient minuteness. We have seen, that, as a matter of fact, it was not considered of obligation upon Christians in the days of the Apostles. We have not found any practice or statement which contradicts this state of things in the Church of the second and third centuries, or which materially breaks in upon it, even of the fourth and fifth centuries. And we might perhaps be contented with this clear evidence from antiquity that Sabbatarianism at any period would be an intruder into the Church. But, in England especially, the controversies subsequent to the Reformation bring the Sabbath very prominently forward, and raise questions concerning it which were never mooted in primitive times. It seems, therefore, desirable, and, indeed, necessary, before we enter upon those questions, to settle these: What was the Sabbath? On what ground was it observed, until the time when, as we suppose, it ceased to be obligatory? How was it intended to be observed, and how was it

observed, while in force? And, why did it cease (if indeed it did cease) to be in force when our Lord rose from the dead?

The first questions to be determined may be stated thus: Was the observance of the Sabbath a matter of Natural or Moral Law, or did it arise solely from external command? If not the former, why not? If the latter, to whom was the external command, which originated the observance, given?

It was scarcely, I think, a matter of Natural or Moral Law, in the sense of being an obligation discoverable without express revelation. Nothing that man finds within him could possibly direct him to the seventh day, in preference to any other day, as a day of rest and worship of God. The utmost that can be said in this respect is what I am going to state. In so far as the commandment to observe the Sabbath implies positions discoverable by the light of reason (namely, that our Creator demands our gratitude and worship, and that these are best exhibited and most surely paid by periodic appropriation of time to Him), there is a Natural or Moral element on which the commandment is founded. Of course, when an external command has been given, obedience to it may and does become moral in a secondary sense—we may see the reasonableness of it, and our duty to conform our conduct to its requirements, considering the relations in which we stand to the promulgator.

But this is not the question at present. In the strict acceptation of the term, the duty of observing the Sabbath is not natural or moral. Perhaps, if we were to ascend to the very earliest conceivable point in the history of the human heart, we should find the moral element of which we are speaking reducible yet further, to general gratitude to the Creator. It was developed as "day unto day uttered speech, and night unto night showed knowledge" (Ps. xix. 2, B. Vers.). Indeed it would be absurd to suppose that all the laws called Natural or Moral manifested themselves in man's heart at once. They would, at least the greater part of them would, have been unmeaning to him, antecedently to experience, and could only have dawned upon him as society expanded. There was nothing to provoke their violation. The ideas could not at first have suggested themselves of honoring parents, or abstaining from adultery, covetousness, theft, or false testimony, or even depriving of life (for death had not entered into the world). On the same principle, I submit, Adam could not have understood a positive command to rest on the seventh day, before the cycle of days had begun, or labor had become laborious enough to necessitate repose. Instincts implanted by the Creator expanded as circumstances called them forth, into the recognition of what we call moral commandments; but no instinct whatever could, without express revelation, expand into

the recognition of the seventh day, as God's day. It is necessary to insist upon this, because, from the point which some persons make of establishing the morality *in toto* of the Fourth Commandment, and their indisposition to be contented with the acknowledgment of a moral element in it, one would suppose them to hold that the Decalogue was imprinted in a formal shape, as the foundation of all morality, on the hearts of our first parents. Virtually, whatever is moral in the Decalogue was there. Formally, very little was there. (Of course, I do not mean to say that no positive precept could be understood by Adam. He had one given to him which he could understand—to abstain from the fruit of a tree obvious to his senses—and he broke it, transgressing thereby one of the few moral obligations of which he was as yet conscious, the obligation to obey his Maker. All I am contending for is, that whatever determination we come to, as to the origin of the observance of the Sabbath Day, such observance was not a matter of natural or moral law, at any rate as to its circumstances. Those circumstances I hold to be, first the particular day, and then the manner in which it was to be observed.)

My position may be further illustrated by the words of Hooker. "Even nature" (he says) "has taught the heathens .... first, that festival solemnities are a part of the exercise of

religion; secondly, that praise, liberality and rest are as natural elements whereof solemnities consist." (V. 70, 5.) Nature did not teach even these things in the earliest spring of mankind, but they are founded on the natural or moral instincts to which we have already adverted, and therefore are natural or moral in a sense in which the direction of these instincts to the seventh day, or even to one day in seven, can never be. That *this* is not natural is evident from a consideration strongly put by Archbishop Bramhall, that the old-world fathers from Adam to Moses are not represented as keeping the Sabbath-day, which we may suppose they would have done had the obligation been discoverable from within. "We find" (says he) "oblations, and priests, and sacrifices, and groves or oratories, and prayers, and thanksgivings, and vows, and whatsoever natural religion doth dictate about the service of God; but we find not one instance of the execution of this supposed law of the seventh-day Sabbath." I may add, that had the law of its observance been natural or moral, the heathen of Canaan, who are reproached and with singular minuteness, for many transgressions of the law of nature, and were therefore cast out before the children of Israel, would surely have been reproached for transgression of this. Now they are nowhere so reproached. Had it again been one of the laws of nature, there would not, I humbly conceive,

have been assigned as reasons for its observance, in one passage, a fact which could not have been known except by revelation, "God's working six days and resting the seventh;" in another, a fact which occurred long after man was created, and in which not humanity in general, but one nation only was interested. "God brought thee forth out of Egypt, therefore God commanded thee to keep the seventh day" (Deut. v. 15).

But, though the Sabbath was not a natural or moral institution, was it not appointed so early in the world's history, that, positive though it be, it may be *almost* deemed a part of man's nature, and so, binding upon mankind for ever? Do we not read in Genesis ii. 3, that "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work which God had created and made"? We do read this. But what does it amount to? It is merely an announcement of what God did, not a setting forth to man of what man should do. Besides, when was it enjoined upon man? One would suppose, from the place in which it is mentioned, immediately after he was created, in Paradise, and under circumstances which, as has been observed already, would have rendered its terms unmeaning to him. And the other arguments about the old-world fathers and the heathen would apply here. Had the Sabbath been a positive institution at any time anterior to the legislation of Moses, the former would

have been noticed as keeping it, the latter censured for neglecting it.

But still, the blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day is mentioned so long before it was actually imposed upon man. This is, at any rate, a stubborn fact. How is it to be accounted for? We may reply with Bede, God sanctified the Sabbath, "non actu et reipsâ, sed decreto et destinatione suâ, quasi diceret, 'Quia quievit Deus die septimo, hinc illum diem ordinavit Sibi sacrum, ut indiceretur festus colendus a Judæis.'" We may remember, that though *we* know perfectly well the cosmogony as it is set forth in Genesis, nay the very words uttered by the Creator during and after the completion of His work, and the counsel and confederation of the glorious Three in One in accomplishing it, there is not sufficient evidence for believing that its great and wondrous tale was disclosed to mankind before Moses wrote it. Genesis was a revelation to Moses, not to Adam. We may urge, with Archbishop Bramhall, "that the sanctifying of the seventh day there, is no more than the 'sanctifying' of Jeremy 'from his mother's womb,' that is the designing or destinating of him to be a prophet; or than the 'separating' of St. Paul 'from his mother's womb.' So the sanctification of the seventh day may signify the decree or determination of God to sanctify it in due time; but *as* Jeremy's actual sanctification, and St. Paul's

actual separation, followed long after they were born, *so* the actual sanctification of the Sabbath might follow long after the ground of God's decree for the sanctification of that day, and the destination of it to that use." Or we may reply fully on the whole question with Archdeacon Paley. He is arguing that the Sabbath was given to the Jews peculiarly and at a certain time. "If the Sabbath had been instituted at the time of the Creation, as the words in Genesis may seem at first sight to import; and if it had been observed all along from that time to the departure of the Jews out of Egypt, a period of about two thousand five hundred years; it appears unaccountable that no mention of it, no occasion of even the obscurest allusion to it should occur, either in the general history of the world before the call of Abraham, which contains, we admit, only a few memoirs of its early ages, and those extremely abridged; or, which is more to be wondered at, in that of the lives of the first three Jewish patriarchs, which in many parts of the account is sufficiently circumstantial and domestic. Nor is there, in the passage above quoted, (he has mentioned Exod. c. xvi.) any intimation that the Sabbath, when appointed to be observed, was only the revival of an ancient institution, which had been neglected, forgotten, or suspended; nor is any such neglect imputed either to the inhabitants of the Old World, or to any part of the family of Noah: nor, lastly,

is any permission recorded to dispense with the institution during the captivity of the Jews in Egypt, or on any other public emergency." And then he proceeds, "The passage in the second chapter of Genesis, which creates the whole controversy on the subject, is not inconsistent with this opinion: for, as the seventh day was erected into a Sabbath, on account of God's resting upon that day from the work of creation, it was natural enough in the historian, when he had related the history of the Creation, and of God's ceasing from it on the seventh day, to add, 'And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that on it He had rested from all His work which God had created and made;' although the blessing and sanctification, *i.e.* the religious distinction and appropriation of that day, were not actually made till many ages afterwards. The words do not assert, that God *then* 'blessed and sanctified' the seventh day, but that He blessed and sanctified it *for that reason;* and if any ask, why the Sabbath, or the sanctification of the seventh day, was *then* mentioned, if it was not *then* appointed, the answer is at hand: the order of connexion and not of time introduced the mention of the Sabbath in the history of the subject which it was ordained to commemorate."

Other reasons may be brought forward, and they will appear in their proper place, to account for this early mention of the seventh day as

connected with blessing and sanctification. But we are, at this moment, only concerned to show that its early mention, and the early declaration of its existence as a Sabbath, in the mind of the Almighty, by no means necessitate an equally early promulgation to man. It is possible, however, that it may be urged that a septenary division of time is to be found very early in Scripture, and that it was almost universal in the heathen world; that such a division would hardly have suggested itself to man without some positive revelation on the subject; that we are bound therefore to suppose that there was a positive revelation, and that the words in Genesis constituted a positive revelation. Hence, it is concluded triumphantly, as those words imply the Sabbath, the Sabbath must have been revealed very early.

This argument, if argument it can be called, may be ingenious, but its premises are scarcely sound, and though they be admitted to be sound, will scarcely prove the point desired. In the first place, though it is true that a septenary division of time is to be found very early in Scripture, it is not true that it was ever general in the heathen world. The month of the Romans was divided into Kalends, Nones, and Ides; and coexistent with these was another division, said to be Etruscan, into Nundines, or market periods, markets being held at intervals of nine days. Then the Greeks divided their month into

Decades. It is only in the East that anything like a septenary division is found to prevail. The Egyptians had it; the Persians had it; and we are told that it may be traced in the Sanscrit, and in all the languages and dialects of India. But when we consider the intercourse of the Jews with Egypt; the expeditions of Egyptian conquerors into Scythia, which, according to Sir Henry Rawlinson, was the cradle of the Persians and the Hindoos, we shall have little difficulty in accounting for this limited prevalence, without imagining a special revelation on the subject. The solar month of the Chinese is, like that of the Greeks, divided into Decades: they have also a division of the year into twenty-four half-months, as we may call them, of about fifteen days each, which are again subdivided into fives. Here is no trace of sevens. If we turn to the New World, we find septenary institutions utterly unknown to the aboriginal inhabitants of the two Americas and of Polynesia; Months are sometimes traceable. So much then for the assertion that the septenary division was almost universal in the heathen world. It may be added that even were it absolutely universal, it would be of no avail unless it were found accompanied by the Sabbath. This we may fearlessly assert it never is. The passages quoted to the effect that the seventh day was a sacred one, have been sufficiently examined by Selden. They are either nothing to the purpose as referring rather to the

day of the month than to that of the week, or they are accidental usages of the number seven, which might be paralleled in abundance by similar usages of other numbers, or they are allusions to heavenly phenomena such as could not fail to strike an attentive observer of nature, or they are obviously derived from intercourse with the East. And, if the septenary division is found *out of Scripture*, without the Sabbath, why may it not occur *in Scripture*, without it? Why may it not be mentioned that Noah was in the Ark seven days before the Flood began (Gen. vii. 10), that intervals of seven days took place in his proceedings twice after the Flood (Gen. viii. 10, 12), that the Syrian Laban spoke of a week (Gen. xxix. 27) in reference to his daughter's marriage, and that Joseph mourned for his father seven days, without it being at all implied that the Sabbath day was an ordinance known and observed before the time of Moses?

To what then, it may be asked, is the division of time to be traced? I answer without hesitation, to man's observation of those "lights in the firmament of heaven" which God placed there "to divide the day from the night," and of which He said further, "let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years." It required no special revelation to direct men to these as convenient indicators of time. The course of the moon, and especially the appearance of the new moon or *νουμηνία*, would suggest

a division, roughly stated, of twenty-eight days. This perhaps would be the first and most prevalent division. It certainly was all but a universal one, for it is found even where weeks were unknown, and where they are still unknown—among the aborigines of the New World. The full moon would supply the fortnight, and the half of it each way, as men grew more and more exact, would supply an approach to a perfect septenary division of time. Seasons would by-and-by be suggested, by the coincidence of the heliacal rising and setting of certain constellations with the state of the productions of the earth; and later, the year itself, by similar observations of the course of the sun as seen by man. With this, however, we are not further concerned. Our purpose is merely to show that a septenary division of time might have suggested itself to man's reason acting upon the luminaries which we find God's providence intended for his guidance in such matters, without any special revelation, much less any hint of the Sabbath being necessarily implied in the existence of such a division.

Before I quit this branch of my subject, I may remark that Dr. Owen institutes a singular comparison (although the point of comparison is not obvious) between Sacrifices and the Sabbath. It is this:—"Sacrifices were constantly observed in Patriarchal times, though we read not of their express institution. Of the Sabbath we have

an express institution, though we read nothing of its observance." The remark at once offers itself. Assuming that Sacrifices are of divine institution, and passing over the *petitio principii* that the divine declaration in Genesis was equivalent to a promulgation of the Sabbath to man, and in fact allowing that the cases are exactly parallel, what is the result? If parallel at first, they must continue to be parallel. If they begin together, they must endure, or determine together. Therefore, either both are in force now, which is more than he would be inclined to contend; or both have determined, which utterly neutralises the object which he has in view, namely, proving the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath from its early and divine commencement.

Two more efforts have been made to prove that the Patriarchs knew of the Sabbath. They are somewhat inconsistent with each other, but they have something in common, and may therefore be mentioned together as bearing upon what will be said afterward.

The duty of observing the Sabbath must be a moral one, for it is mentioned in the Tables of the Ten Commandments, which are essentially of a moral character.

The duty of observing the Sabbath must have been known of old time, whether as a moral or as a positive duty, and neglected, for the Israelites are told in the Tables of the Ten Commandments to remember it.

In reference to the former of these assertions the great authority of Hooker is generally quoted. He makes a distinction, as you are aware, in iii. 7. 5, 6, between the Ten Commandments delivered by the Almighty, which he calls moral and perpetual, and the "laws and ordinances" delivered by Moses, which he says were positive and for the most part limited to the land of Canaan. Two or three things, however, seem to have escaped the notice even of this great master of moral theology. First, That he himself distinguishes in another place (v. 70. 5) between what nature teaches and what God appointed to the Israelites. Secondly, That he himself allows that days, *i. e.* particular days, of solemnity are part of the appointed or positive law. Thirdly, That though the Sabbath be called moral by him, he himself allows a positive element in the command to keep it, which he says may be altered and has been altered by change of the day and manner of keeping. And fourthly, that if, according to his own admission, some portion of the "laws and ordinances" is not positive but moral, it is possible that some portion of the Ten Commandments may be not moral but positive, and so—mutable (i. 15. 1). Hooker seems, therefore, to have neutralised his own distinction. A sounder view seems to be, (not to press at this moment the opinion of Calvin, that the Decalogue was intended to be a synopsis of

the whole law, moral, ceremonial, political) that the moral element contained in the Fourth Commandment, viz. the obligation to serve God at some time, is quite enough to warrant its admission into a moral document. The Sabbath itself might be positive, and *à fortiori* the manner of observing it positive, or adapted to the Jewish Dispensation, and so, when that Dispensation has ended, capable of being swept away. Selden, in his Table Talk, puts in reference to the Fifth Commandment, and very clearly and forcibly, a question which may in principle be applied to the Fourth, and which he intends to be so applied. "Why should I think all the Fourth Commandment belongs to me, when all the Fifth does not? What land will the Lord give me for honoring my father? It was spoken to the Jews with reference to the land of Canaan; but the meaning is, 'If I honor my parents, God will also bless me.' We read the Commandments in the Church Service as we do David's Psalms; not that all there concerns us, but a great deal of them does."

As for the assertion that the duty of observing the Sabbath must have been known of old time, whether as a moral or as a positive duty, and neglected, because the Israelites are told in the Table of the Ten Commandments to remember it, it might suffice to quote the words of Bishop Beveridge. He differs, indeed, from the view which I take of the time when the law of the

Sabbath was laid down; but this is another matter. "This," he says, "the Fourth, is the only Commandment that we are particularly required to 'remember.' The reason is, because all the others were written at first on the tables of our hearts, engraven in our very nature, so that we may have a connatural sense of them upon our minds; and, therefore, cannot be said properly to remember them, but rather to feel them, being sensible and conscious to ourselves of the duty and obligation to observe them. But *this* is a positive precept, given to a man after he was made, and therefore not imprinted in his heart, but conveyed through his ears into it by the external revelation or Word of God, who therefore commands us to remember it, to keep it in our hearts, so as to call it to mind on all occasions at the return of every Sabbath day, that we must keep that holy. 'Remember,' saith he, 'that thou keep holy the Sabbath day;' or rather, as it is in the original, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy,'—'Remember the day itself, and to keep it holy when it comes.'"

Thus far Bishop Beveridge, whom I quote as agreeing with me that the Sabbath was not part of the Moral Law (though it is found in the Decalogue), but of a positive character; a point to which he believes that the word "Remember" refers. He holds indeed what I cannot hold to

be proved, that the Sabbath was commanded to Adam, kept by the Patriarchs, and intermitted in Egypt only through necessity. But he candidly confesses that we have no certain footsteps of it until about a month after the children of Israel came out of Egypt. This point of time, of which I will quote the description from the Book of Exodus, I hold, with many writers, ancient and modern, to be the time when the Sabbath was first communicated to man, in the form of a positive ordinance given to the Israelites. It will appear from the narrative that it was a new thing to them; that they could not or would not understand it; and that some of them transgressed it, though enforced in a miraculous manner. The word "Remember," then, though it may have reference to the Sabbath being positive and not moral, I should suppose referred *at the moment when it was solemnly proclaimed from* Sinai, to *this particular point of time.* I should not resort at all *to old time* for its significancy. *In after days* the word "Remember" said much more. "Remember the Sabbath day, O Israel, the sign of the Covenant between thee and thy God. Remember it, for it is full of meanings, historical, regulative, testamental, prophetic, typical."

Of this, however, more bye and bye.

We read thus in Exodus xvi. 4, 5:—"Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people

shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them whether they will walk in My law or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily."

And in verse 22, we read:—"And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man. And all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of (a) holy Sabbath unto the Lord. Bake what ye will bake, and seethe what ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over, lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up until the morning, as Moses bade: and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is (a) Sabbath, in it there shall be none. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See for that the Lord hath *given you the Sabbath*, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two

days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day."

Such was, I conceive, the first promulgation of the Sabbath. It will be observed that there is in it not the faintest allusion to the Creation words respecting the seventh day. I cannot say, respecting the "Sabbath day," for that word does not occur in Genesis. Hengstenberg, in commenting on the passage, notices this critical point, and also the fact that before this time not the slightest reference to the Sabbath as a practical institution is to be found in Scripture. And then he makes the following remarks:—

"The context offers a triple proof that the Sabbath was till then entirely unknown to the Israelites.

"When a double portion fell on the sixth day (for which God had prepared Moses, though the latter had certainly not mentioned it to the people), the rulers came and told Moses. They are astonished at the Providence of God, that they had found a double quantity of manna, and ask what they are to do with it. The reply which Moses makes them, shows us the reason of their bringing him the information. This to them inexplicable occurrence is *first* explained in his reply. *Then follow* directions how to dispose of the surplus. Now neither of these, the astonishment or the perplexity, could have arisen, if the Sabbath had

been already known and observed. We are led to the same conclusion, when we find that, notwithstanding the instructions of Moses, some of the people went out on the Sabbath to gather, shewing how new a thing it was to the people, and how difficult it was at first to conform. And we infer it also from the total absence in the words of Moses of a reference to an already existing Sabbath ordinance. Liebetrut indeed thinks that the words of Moses, 'This is that which the Lord said,' show that the Sabbath was already known, since no such declaration is made in verses 4 and 5. But Moses is not referring here to an earlier declaration of the Lord, but to something actually said by the Lord when pouring out the double portion of manna on the sixth day: 'This is that which the Lord hath said (by this occurrence), to morrow is the rest of a holy Sabbath to the Lord.'"

"No doubt remains then," says the same writer, "that the Sabbath was first instituted in connexion with the whole of the Mosaic economy. 'The Lord hath given you the Sabbath.'"

But wherefore was the Sabbath instituted? It was a sign, full of meaning between God and His people—a sign or memorial, that He and none but He had given them rest from their toils in Egypt; that to Him (and not to any false God or symbol of a God) they owed their de-

liverance from the furnace of the oppressor—a sign or promise, that He would extend and consolidate that rest by putting them in possession of the land of Canaan—a sign (to the spiritually-minded among them at least), exhibiting under the form of rest from their own works, rest from sin—a sign prophetic of a better rest, of repose on the merits of the great Antitype of their leader into the promised land—nay a sign reaching into the very distant future, and emblematic of rest in heaven.

Being a sign in these respects, it was intended to be an encouragement. And I think I may fairly say that it was an encouragement of the very highest kind. God condescended to exhibit Himself, the great Architect of the world, (though "He fainteth not, neither is weary") as the great Archetype both of labour and of rest. In six days He made the world—on the seventh day He rested from His work and "was refreshed." Let His people then not repine at their labours, but look to the rest prepared as a certain sequel to them. And lest they imagine that this is a mere after thought, let them know, by the account of the Creation, that this labour and this rest were foreseen from the foundation of the world. Let them know that the state of God's people generally, and the toils of each individual Israelite, his wanderings, his afflictions, his sins, were known long before—that if they labour awhile, a rest is provided, as an earnest of the God-man,

who, while He Himself enters not into His rest without suffering, is the haven in which the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.

Besides, however, being a sign of these great things, the Sabbath was to be a federal sign and a present blessing. It was to be a federal sign: so long as they observed it, they were to be blessed, and the possession of their land was ensured to them. And they could scarcely, except through wilfulness, forget it. For the seventh-day Sabbath did not stand alone—it was not an isolated ordinance of their religion. There was also a seventh-week Sabbath, a seventh-month Sabbath, a seventh-year Sabbath, a seven-times-seven-year Sabbath, or year of Jubilee. Each of these looked forward to that beyond it; and the last of them all looked forward to the "acceptable year" and to Him who was to appear therein. There were also annual Festivals, the Passover, Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles, and an annual Fast, that of the Great Day of Atonement, all of which were sometimes called Sabbaths. The seventh new moon (*νουμηνία*), or Feast of Trumpets, was a sort of Sabbath. As a miracle introduced the observance of the first weekly Sabbath which has been recorded, so the peculiarity of their climate was such as to encourage their observance of the Sabbaths, both in earing time and in harvest; and the promise that no man should desire their

land in their absence (Exod. xxxiv. 24) was to encourage them to appear before God on the occasions of three of the great yearly Sabbatic Festivals. For subsistence in the seventh year they were to have what the land should produce of itself. And to induce them to celebrate the Jubilee, "God would command His blessing upon them in the sixth year, and it should bring forth fruits for three years." The wilful breaker of the Sabbath was to be put to death. And if a national neglect of the ordinance took place, "the land should be desolated and enjoy her Sabbaths."

It is, I think, of no small importance to remark that the seventh-day Sabbath did not stand alone, but was a part and a specimen of a system intertwining itself with the whole Jewish polity. Its character as a sign, and a sign to a particular people, is thus made especially manifest, and one cannot help seeing that the Fourth Commandment, under which, as a general head, all Sabbatical ordinances must be ranged, is not purely of a moral character, could not have suggested itself to the human heart without a special revelation, but was, in many respects, positive, temporary, local, and national. Such Sabbatical laws could not in the mass have been applied to the world at large; therefore, when the world at large had been admitted into the covenant, they must necessarily have passed away together. There is no possible expedient by which we can

retain the seventh-day Sabbath, while we reject the penalties attached to its violation—and the obligation to observe the Sabbaths of longer interval—or by which again we can retain the seventh-day Sabbath, and alter the time of its recurrence or the manner of its celebration. If it is urged that in the version of the Fourth Commandment given in Exodus, God refers to an earlier Sabbath dating from the Creation, a reply is ready, over and above that which has been offered above. God has omitted this reference in the version given in Deuteronomy, and in lieu of it introduced a reference to labours endured in Egypt, thus bringing out more clearly the character of the Sabbath as a sign to a particular people. Nay in Exodus itself, in the preface to the Decalogue, He says, "I am the Lord thy God that brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Bishop Warburton observes very justly, "that nothing but a rite by institution of *positive law* could serve for a sign or token of a covenant between God and a particular selected people; for besides its use for a remembrance of the covenant, it was to serve them as a partition wall to separate them from other nations; and this a rite by positive institution might well do [though used before by some other people, or even borrowed from them]. But a natural duty has no capacity of being thus employed; because a practice observed by *all* nations would obli-

terate every trace of a sign or token of a covenant made with one."

Well, but if the Sabbath, strictly so called, was a positive institution of the Jewish nation—a sign of the many things which have been mentioned—and a federal sign, embracing many under it, have we given a full account of it? By no means; we have to show that it was to be so observed as to be a present blessing. *Rest* was to be its primary characteristic. Its very name, and its appearance as the antithesis of labour, imply this. But what sort of rest? Surely not total inactivity, *ἀργία* in the worst sense of the word, intermission of all exercise of body, of mind, of affections personal or social, moral or spiritual. Surely it was not designed that on this day the whole machine, so to speak, of Jewish humanity should be stopped, and the pulsations of a mighty nation chilled, even deadened into silence. Such a view has, I firmly believe, no foundation in Scripture. The Israelites were indeed to rest from all labour for subsistence, they were to do no servile work, no fire was to be kindled in their habitations, on the Sabbath day (though this prohibition did not forbid the preparation of what every man must eat, for that might be done by them), they were to carry no burdens, they were to restrain their feet from unnecessary journeys, and to break off their ordinary ways and professions; these points we gather most certainly from Scrip-

ture. But the Rest was (except on the Great Day of Atonement, which alone was a Fast) of the nature of a Festival. Men might eat bread with their friends on that day, as our Saviour's example shows. Men might do works of charity or kindness on that day; His example shows this again. And it was a Festival to God as well as to themselves—"Non sibi solum, sed Deo vacabant." It was marked publicly by double sacrifices, and by change of the shew-bread, by the receiving of instruction (this is evidenced by the provision that the whole law should be read in the Sabbatical year) from the Priests and Levites who were scattered up and down the country, and from the Prophets, as appears from the question, "Why resortest thou to the Prophet to-day, it is neither New Moon nor Sabbath?" It was further marked by the institution of convocations, which would not have been holy meetings, but mere crowds, except they were employed in prayer and instruction. Singing praises to God must also be considered to have formed a part of Sabbath worship, if we may trust that heading of one of the Psalms, "For the Sabbath Day." (These convocations would seem to have been the germ of the synagogues in which Moses and the Prophets were read on the Sabbath.) In families, the day was marked by release of servants and of cattle from their ordinary work, and in the case of individual Israelites, no doubt contemplation of God's works

and meditation in God's law, found a place in the Rest provided for them.

It will be said, perhaps, that this is gathered not from the Fourth Commandment merely, but from the Pentateuch generally; and not even from the Pentateuch merely, but from the Prophets, and from our Lord's practice and language recorded in the New Testament. It is so; but no Israelite could observe the Fourth Commandment independently of its development in the remainder of the books of Moses; the Prophets cannot be understood to enforce anything new in reference to the Sabbath; and our Lord explained the meaning of both the Law and the Prophets. Perhaps Josephus may be cited in point (Antiq. xvi. 2, 3): "The seventh day we set apart from labour; it is dedicated to the learning of our customs and laws, we thinking it proper to reflect on them, as well as on any good thing else, in order to our avoiding of sin." If it be said that these are not Josephus' own sentiments, but expressions put by him into the mouth of an orator, here is a passage in which he speaks in his own person (c. Ap. ii. 18): "Moses permitted the people to leave off their other employments, and to assemble together for the hearing of the law and learning it exactly, and this, not once or twice or oftener, but every week." What Philo says is to the same effect. I conceive, then, that I am not wrong in believing that the Rest of

the Jews was by no means that utter indolence which a fatigued animal nature enjoys and is contented with;

> "For what are men better than sheep or goats
> That nourish a blind life within the brain,
> If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
> Both for themselves and those who call them friend?"

It was a rest, strict indeed, but social—a social rest, far removed from the licentiousness with which the Prophets reproached their countrymen—and a strict rest, but far removed from the narrow-minded and foolish refinements with which the Pharisees had overlaid the original institution by the time of our Saviour, and which have been increased tenfold by Talmudical writers.

That it was not uniformly observed as it should have been observed, that it was sometimes misused, sometimes almost disused, and almost forgotten as God's federal sign, the Prophets tell us. Nehemiah gives us to understand this both by words and by the regulations by which he was obliged to reinforce it. The seventy years' captivity, which was expressly a punishment for neglect of the Sabbatical year, is an indication of a want of faith, which, it may be, had had its commencement in neglect of the seventh-day Sabbath. After the captivity it was observed indeed, but its observance (the symbolical meaning of it having been, in a great measure, overlooked) degenerated into superstition. By a

reaction, similar to that which we shall see bye and bye befel another institution, the Lord's Day, and which is characteristic more or less of all religious revivals, what was neglected before, or used before with too much laxity in one direction, that of festivity, was made a matter of punctilious conscientiousness, and observed over scrupulously in another direction, that of rest.

I may mention in illustration of this assertion the striking fact, which appears both in Josephus and in the Apocrypha, that at the commencement of the Maccabean struggle, a thousand Jews suffered themselves to be slain without resistance, rather than violate the Sabbath by attempting a defence. A disaster so signal and so monstrous opened the eyes of the nation to the unreasonableness of the principle which had subjected them to it. They modified it, therefore, to a certain extent, and it was declared to be lawful to defend themselves, if attacked, on the Sabbath day, but not to make an attack. Even this modified form of scrupulousness became an injury to them. Pompey, while besieging Jerusalem, discovered the nature of their feelings on the subject. He argued, and very naturally, that if he employed his army on the Sabbath, not in direct assaults, but in such warlike preparations as should better enable him to attack on the morrow, he should do so without molestation. This method he accordingly adopted, and,

by the advantage thus obtained, eventually took the city.

The Pharisees of our Lord's time were strict observers of the Sabbath (though we do not find even *them* objecting to social entertainments on that day). Some notable instances of their superstitiousness are recorded. It was wrong to heal a sick person on the Sabbath day. It was wrong for that person, after he had been healed, to take up his bed and carry it to his house. It was wrong for the disciples, as they walked through the corn-fields on the Sabbath day, to gather corn and rub it from the ears with their hands. A perversion of a text in Exodus was the foundation of the limitation of bodily exercise to what was called a Sabbath-day's journey. The rabbinical doctors proceeded even further. They invented thirty-nine negative precepts concerning things not to be done on that day, besides many others which were appendages to them. Two of them may serve as specimens of the whole:—'Grass may not be walked upon, lest it should be bruised, which would be a sort of threshing'—'Nailed shoes may not be worn on that day, for this would be to bear a burden'—instances these of almost grotesque misinterpretation of Scripture.

The heathen fancied, some of them, that the Sabbath was a day of mere superstitious idleness; others, that it was a fast. The latter fancy may in part be accounted for by the fact that "the

Great Day of Atonement," *the* Fast of the Jews, is called in Scripture a Sabbath. But both this and the other resulted in a great measure from the extreme rigor with which the Pharisees were found observing it, at the time when the Romans first came in contact with the Jews. Hence Tacitus, in his confused notice of Jewish history and customs, (which, by the way, even in its mistakes, seems to show that the Sabbath was a national, not a world-wide institution,) has these words: "Continuum sex dierum iter emensi, Ebræi septimo, pulsis cultoribus, obtinuere terras in quibus urbs et templum dicata sunt . . . . . Septimo die otium placuisse ferunt, quia is finem laborum tulerat . . . . . Dein, blandiente inertiâ, septimum quoque annum ignaviæ datum." Hence Suetonius cites Octavius as saying, "Ne Judæus quidem, mî Tiberî, tam diligenter Sabbatis jejunium servat, quam ego hodie servavi." Hence Justin says of Moses, "Quo, (scilicet ad montem Synæ) septem dierum jejunio per deserta Arabiæ cum populo suo fatigatus cum tandem venisset, septimum diem, more gentis, Sabbatum appellatum." The passage in Juvenal,

> "Sed pater in causâ est, cui septima quæque fuit lux
> Ignava, et partem vitæ non attigit ullam."

and those in Martial, Persius, Ovid, and Petronius, will occur to us all.

To Pharisaic notions of the Sabbath our Saviour uniformly opposed Himself. "The Sabbath was made for man," was His authoritative

declaration, and "not man for the Sabbath." The rest implied in it was intended for the good of God's people, and was a means to an end. It was not, and it could not have been intended to be, an end in itself, for which man should be distressed and constrained by unreasonable annoyances. It was a day, therefore, in which man's welfare was to be wrought out, in a different way indeed from that appropriated to other days, but still wrought out. "My Father worketh on it, and hath been working hitherto; I Myself work on it," is His language in His reply to those who cavilled at His doing good on the Sabbath. "In that reply," says Dean Trench, "He seeks to lift up the cavillers to the true standing point from which to contemplate the Sabbath, and His own relation to it as the only-begotten of the Father. He is no more a breaker of the Sabbath than God is, when He upholds with an energy that knows no pause the work of His creation from hour to hour and from moment to moment. 'My Father worketh hitherto and I work;' My work is but a reflex of His work. Abstinence from outward work belongs not to the idea of the Sabbath, it is only more or less the necessary condition of it for beings so framed as ever to be in danger of losing the true collection and rest of the spirit in the multiplicity of earthly toil and business. Man indeed must rest from his work if a higher work is to find place in him. He scatters himself in his

work, and therefore he must collect himself anew, and have seasons for so doing. But with Him who is one with the Father it is otherwise. In Him, the deepest rest is not excluded by the highest activity; nay, rather in God they are one and the same." "The rest of God (says Stier, writing in the same tone) is no mere inactivity; but to speak after the manner of the Jews, (and thus to demonstrate their error by their own words,) He Himself *breaks* continually His great Sabbath." Bengel says, "Si non operaretur, ubi esset ipsum Sabbatum?" Braune says, "If God had rested as the Jews rested on the Sabbath, no sun would have shone, no flowers would have bloomed, all creation would have languished, all the universe been dissolved. 'He imparts to nature her invigorating forces,' as Herder expresses it, 'causes the rain to fall and the fruits to grow, yea, even the waters of Bethesda to bubble forth on the Sabbath, so that no Jew might have been held unrighteous in descending for cure, yea, even would have waited for it on the Sabbath day.'" And—"He doeth good on the Sabbath day, else must the sick man whom God's help, sought or experienced on the Sabbath day, has healed, tarry upon his sick couch still." So men, albeit they rest from their ordinary work-day labours, may on the Sabbath be working their own good and the good of their fellow men,—doing well on the Sabbath, —healing on the Sabbath,—teaching or learning

on the Sabbath,—initiating into the covenant on the Sabbath,—performing works necessary for life, or for the preserving of life, whether of man or beast, on the Sabbath,—enjoying the contemplation of God's works on the Sabbath,—nay, even joining with their brethren in social intercourse on the Sabbath. In all these things, man, as represented by the Son of Man, is lord of the Sabbath. Declare them to be unlawful,—you reverse God's order, the Sabbath becomes lord of man.

Such, if indeed I have read it aright, was our Lord's language touching the Sabbath; and I think in particular that I am justified in attaching to the words "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," the interpretation here put upon them, and no other. It is, I know, very common to dissociate the two propositions, and to argue from the former of them, taken by itself, that the Sabbath is of perpetual obligation. The context shows this interpretation to be inadmissible. Had people been questioning the then obligation of it, or professing that it was already repealed, *then* the words of our Lord in the former proposition might have asserted its present, and indeed its continuing obligation. He might have said, "the Sabbath was made for man," but He would surely have either paused there as having said enough, or if he subjoined anything, would have added, "and therefore it can never be abrogated." But the

real question was, which is the more important, the Sabbath or man? Which is the more precious in God's sight, the ordinance or the moral being? which is the end? which is made for the other? Our Lord replies, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Just as if a person were about to sacrifice his life for the preservation of his gold,—one would say to him, "Gold was made for man, not man for gold." This would not of course imply that gold and no other sort of money must necessarily be for ever the medium of commerce. Such might or might not be the case, but it could not be gathered legitimately from the mere terms of the expostulation.

But supposing this point to be settled, the following remarks may be fairly made upon what has been said:—

First, that the Sabbath, as represented above, has a character more evangelical than one has been accustomed to attribute to it; is scarcely the exact Institution to the continuance of which the Fathers objected, or which the Romish Doctors, and the Puritans, and of later years the Scottish Presbyterians more or less chose as their model.

Secondly, that our Lord Himself appears to have observed the Sabbath in the way that He recommended it to be observed, and does not appear to have formally abrogated it.

Thirdly, that it is not quite evident why an

institution capable of this favourable construction should have been abrogated.

I have no difficulty in replying to these remarks.

As to the character of the Sabbath, the passages of Scripture to which allusion has been made, the account of it given by Josephus, and the teaching of Christ, seem to make it such as I have described. The Pharisees and the Rabbins misunderstood its character; and we, I think, should equally misunderstand it, if we supposed that Christ recognised their doctrine as that which Moses intended, and Scripture in general warranted; or that He said of it, "This may have done very well in past time, but I will show you a more excellent way." This was not His language. When He touched upon it, it was to explain not to supersede the law of Moses respecting it. The time had not yet arrived for that. He was bound to fulfil the whole law—political, ceremonial, moral—and He did so—the law of the Sabbath, the law of circumcision, the law of attendance at feasts, the law of tribute to the Temple, as well as the weightier matters which concern the inner man. But so deeply ingrained had the traditional teaching concerning the Sabbath become, that the gloss was mistaken for the text, and the word of the expositor, the inculcation of mere rest, the condensation of all religion into the ultra-ritual observance of mere rest on one day, was taken

for the word of God. Hence, when He cleared away these cobwebs, He was supposed to be, not fulfilling the law in its true import, but destroying it altogether. He made it appear worthy of God, as a step in the economy of grace, but He did not therefore make it an ordinance to survive, or capable of surviving, the other shadows of the law. For (it cannot be repeated too often), the seventh-day Sabbath was only a part of the Jewish Sabbatical system, and that system, considered as a whole, was by no means an evangelical one. It was a system designed, among other things, to keep the Jews separate from the rest of the world, as depositaries of what amount of truth God had thought fit to reveal to them, and to remind them at every turn of the responsibilities of their condition. Accordingly, with every abatement that can be made for the false elements with which the Pharisees had overlaid it, it was essentially a system of prohibitions and restrictions—"touch not, taste not, handle not"—it was a system of which fear of transgression was the predominant motive, not clear perception and love of the right; it was a system by which truth was rather shadowed than revealed—a system of types and figures, the meaning of which was not fully known to any, and was by very few appreciated at all. And, however understood, it was, as an unsubstantial and typical system, to be with the law generally swept away when the reality

should come, when the antitype should be manifested. This was not to be till the Resurrection. Till that time our Lord observed the Law. Circumcision, Holy-days, and Sabbaths, were a part of the ordinances to which He submitted Himself for a while, though, as is evident from His practice and teaching, from His spiritualizing of the Law, and from His proclaiming "the acceptable year" and announcing Himself as its introducer, He considered them to be things decaying and waxing old, and ready to vanish away. The Apostles, after the Resurrection, struck a different note, for the time for striking it had come. All things are new, said they—new in Him and because of Him—He is the true rest, the true or Great Sabbath, of which all other Sabbaths were but heralds. They waited to tell their message: having told it, they have past away. Judaism, whether in theory or in practice, it matters not which, whether it develop itself in the observance of the Law as it was intended, or in that astute and subtle refinement of it introduced by the Pharisees and Rabbins, has vanished away. This was from the beginning implied in their preaching, and it was not at first necessary to be explicit. But, as time went on, Judaism began to intrude itself into the Church. Hence the Council of Jerusalem. Hence the text and its assertion, that no man should condemn his brother for neglecting Sabbaths and other ordinances of the Law. Still, though the Council

had spoken and Paul had written, Judaism would thrust forward its pretensions, perhaps with more vexatious accretions than before, and blended with various heresies. Hence the Fathers argued against it without pausing to discriminate between the pure and the impure forms of it. And Romanist, Puritan, and Presbyterian alike, in so far as they adopted Sabbatarianism, exhibited an exaggerated revival, not merely of the Law of Moses (that had been unmeaning enough, now that the reality had come), but of the Pharisaic glosses, which even in our Lord's time had become grievous to be borne. Taken at its very best, the earthly Sabbath was no true rest, it was a shadow of the true rest, a shadow not fully realized by deliverance from Egypt or by entrance upon Canaan, but only by deliverance from sin. This, the true Joshua, and He alone, was by His death to accomplish, by His Resurrection to prove, by His sending of the Holy Ghost to communicate to His people here, and by receiving them to Himself to impart to them more perfectly hereafter.

Therefore, the Sabbath, the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, with everything contained under the word Sabbath, or akin to it, days and times and years, the strongholds and yet the weaknesses of the Law, is abolished. It was a positive ordinance of Judaism, and with Judaism has disappeared. But this is without prejudice to the establishment of the

Lord's Day, and without its being at all necessary to seek for the Lord's Day, either identity in substance, or directly antitypical connexion, with the Sabbath. How far the Lord's Day, besides being, as I showed in an earlier Lecture, a positive ordinance of Scriptural and Apostolical Christianity, is one of the forms in which the σαββατισμὸς which remaineth for the people of God would naturally and of course find expression; how far it is analogous to the Sabbath, and whether it may not contain in it the same elements though in a different order, and arranged in the spirit of love which casteth out fear, I shall consider in the next Lecture.

LECTURE V

HEBREWS IV. 8, 9.

FOR IF JESUS (JOSHUA) HAD GIVEN THEM REST, THEN WOULD HE NOT AFTERWARDS HAVE SPOKEN OF ANOTHER DAY.
THERE REMAINETH THEREFORE A REST, (A KEEPING OF SABBATH,) FOR THE PEOPLE OF GOD.

Εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας.
Αρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

I CONCLUDED my Fourth Lecture with three remarks:

First, that the Sabbath properly so called, the Sabbath of the Jews, with everything connected with it as a positive ordinance, was swept away by Christianity.

Secondly, that this is without prejudice to the Lord's Day; and

Thirdly, that it is not necessary to seek for the Lord's Day, either identity in substance, or directly antitypical connexion, with the Sabbath.

Certain passages however have been brought forward, as tending to invalidate these propositions. *Three of them* are of the nature of prophecies, uttered respectively by Isaiah, by Ezekiel, and by our Lord. From these it is

argued that the Sabbath is still of obligation. *Three of them* occur in the writings of St. Paul. It is said of these, that if they are understood as destructive of the Sabbath, they render all Christian Holydays, the Lord's Day amongst them, indifferent, not to say unlawful. *Another passage* is that contained in my text. This has been understood in two very different ways, each of them, I believe, containing an element of truth, but each of them blended with some error.

The course of my present Lecture will be—first to discuss the three prophecies to which I allude: then to inquire into the true meaning of the passages adduced from St. Paul's writings: and lastly, so far as I may be able, to grasp the argument in the Hebrews;

"For if Jesus (Joshua) had given them rest, then would he not afterwards have spoken of another day.

"There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God."

We shall, I think, as we proceed, find the solution of various questions which have hitherto been left open till the time for their discussion should arrive.

And first of the three prophecies.

It is said in one of Isaiah's visions, (c. lxvi. 23,) which is obviously not to be limited to the Jews and their fortunes, that "from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before God." Now from this

it has been urged that the Sabbath cannot be of a transitory nature, or it would not have been mentioned thus. It has, however, escaped the notice of those who hold this argument, that if the continuance of the Sabbath Festival is proved by this passage, so is the continuance of the New-moon Festival. This they would hardly be inclined to allow. And yet by their own showing they must allow it. No less is said of the one than of the other, and, we may add, no more. I see not then what can be gathered from it, except an assurance, expressed in the language of the Jews, on God's part, that in the glorious dispensation which He will manifest, whether on earth or in heaven, His worship will never be intermitted, will never be broken off by fits of neglect or rebellion, as was too frequently the case with the Jewish nation.

The passage alleged from Ezekiel (c. xlvi. 3, 4) is very similar to that from Isaiah, and may be disposed of in the same way.

But granting that no real difficulty is caused by these prophecies, what, it is said, can be made of our Lord's own words, "Pray that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day?" He is speaking, be it observed, of the difficulties which would meet the disciples in their flight, just before the siege of Jerusalem. Now that siege was to occur many years after His words were uttered. Do they not then imply, that at that time, (and if then, why not

for ever?) the Sabbath day would exist with all its religious obligations? that it would be as grievous to the religious man to employ it in flight, as it could be to the man of flesh and blood to encounter the horrors of winter, without having where to lay his head?

A very few moments' thought will show the untenableness of this argument. In a nation like that of the Jews, in which the fiction of the "Sabbath-day's journey" prevailed extensively, it was no doubt considered wrong to assist the traveller, however urgent his errand, in his movements on the Sabbath day. All possible impediments, therefore, would be thrown in the way of the fugitives, by those who were still zealous for the supposed requirements of the law. They would render them no aid, they would assail with obloquy, if with nothing worse, the violators of the sanctity of the Sabbath. A Roman Satirist asserted of the Jews that they considered it to be their duty

> "Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
> Quæsitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos;"

if this were so, they would certainly be yet more uncharitable to those who were in their eyes not merely aliens, but apostates; not merely ignorant of their law, but despisers of it and contributors to its overthrow. What wonder then, that our Blessed Lord, foreseeing that the Sabbath would still exist as a fact though no longer obligatory as an institution, and would still be cherished by

the Jews, should have bid His disciples pray, that their flight be not cast, not merely in the time of winter, but on a day which would expose them to the yet keener blasts of those who would resent a violation of their ancient day of rest. It may be that our Lord foresaw a lingering regard on the part of His disciples for this remnant of the Jewish law, such as we know the Nazarenes long entertained, and that He hinted at what their personal feelings would be. Of this, however, we have no evidence. Perhaps then it is safer to conclude that He spoke merely of a certain external circumstance, the averting of which, as its presence would increase their trials, should be made the subject of prayer.

I have only noticed these passages, because they have been sometimes urged in support of the Sabbatarian view of the Lord's Day. It has been imagined that whatever evidence can be brought that the Sabbath exists still, will assist in the transfer of the spirit of the Sabbath, or of the Sabbath itself to the Lord's Day. It would do nothing of the sort. It would merely strengthen that very extreme opinion that the seventh day, or Saturday Sabbath, is binding upon Christians. The difficulty of the transfer would remain. Scripture does not sanction it. The Fathers do not sanction it. Both Scripture and the Fathers speak of the Lord's Day as distinct from the Sabbath. Both Scripture and the Fathers speak of the Sabbath as done away.

Yes, but, says an objector, maintaining what we have called the purely Ecclesiastical theory, what the Fathers say may be interpreted more loosely. A practice may be Ecclesiastical, Apostolical if you please, and yet have no ground in Scripture. We find passages in the Galatians, Colossians, and Romans, for instance, which seem to say that all observance of days, especially of Sabbath days, is but a remnant of Judaism. The Sabbath was not directly a type of the Lord's Day, and is rarely, if ever, urged by the Fathers as a type of it. So Scripture does not justify the Lord's Day, either literally or typically; quite the reverse. The Lord's Day is therefore simply a Church ordinance, (that we say not simply a civil ordinance,) it is not a Scripture ordinance. Christianity has indeed a Sabbath, but the Christian's whole life is a Sabbath. The Lord's Day need not be on the first day of the week; it might be on any day if the Church so willed it. It is only a condescension to human weakness that it exists at all. It would be an evidence of a higher state of Christianity in the world, if we could dispense with it altogether. There are, or may be supposed to be, many good men who could do without it, or even exult in a religious non-observance of it.

As to the interpretation of the Fathers. All I adduce them for is this,—to be witnesses to the facts, that the Sabbath was no longer of obligation; that it did not exist in the Lord's Day,

i. e. that it was not transferred to it: but that the Lord's Day did exist, immediately after the close of the Canon, as an ordinance not formally made, but recognised as being as thoroughly a divine and Christian institution, as any of those mentioned in my Second Lecture; and that it has, therefore, the same Scriptural foundation that they have. They cannot, except by forcing them to speak the language of later times, be made to imply that the Lord's Day was *merely* an Ecclesiastical institution. So much for the first class of objections. For the next, what are the passages in Scripture upon which the objector depends? The first is Galatians iv. 9—11. "But now after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." The second is Colossians ii. 16, 17. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath Days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." The third is Romans xiv. 6. "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the

day, unto the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks."

Now it is said very confidently, could St. Paul have written thus, if any day had been esteemed by him as of obligation on the practice of Christians?

I believe he could, for

First, in the Galatians and Colossians he is treating entirely of the Jewish Law. Not days simply are before his thoughts, but Sabbath days, festal seasons or times, (as the Seven Days of the Passover,) New Moons, Sabbatical Months, Sabbatical Years, all of them distinctive features of Judaism, are aimed at. He is not thinking, so far as we can gather his thoughts from the context, of anything Christian, but simply protesting against the retention of anything Jewish. The very terms which he uses, will not include Christian days, they are essentially Jewish. Nor have we any right to say, that analogically days are forbidden under Christianity. Analogy, if it proved or could prove anything, would rather go to show that these days of Judaism, which are confessedly σκιαὶ, or rather parts of a σκιὰ, or dispensation of shadows, must have their counterparts in corresponding Christian institutions. It is, however, worth notice, that St. Paul according to his own testimony (1 Cor. xvi. 2) had already

urged on the very Galatians whom he desires not to be bound by Jewish days, the performance of the duty of alms-giving on a certain Christian day, the first day of the week. He would therefore, so at least it seems to me, have been somewhat inconsistent with himself, had he intended to state in the Epistle to the Galatians at any rate that all days are alike under Christianity.

And a similar train of remark will apply to the passage in the Romans. The Apostle is there urging upon his disciples the duty of mutual forbearance and tenderness for one another's scruples. There were many things connected with Judaism and Heathenism in respect to which these virtues might find due exercise. Meat was sold in the public markets, which might or might not have been consecrated to idols. An idol was indeed nothing in the world (as he told the Corinthians), and such consecration was a mere futile ceremony. The strong-minded man would eat meat, asking no questions. The weaker brother would decline to eat of it, and content himself with herbs, lest he should give the slightest countenance to idolatry. Let not the former condemn the latter as superstitious—let not the latter condemn the former as unscrupulous.

So again with respect to Judaism. Some would observe Jewish days as a matter of conscience, though they were converted to Christianity, lest they should cast any slight upon things

which were originally of God's ordaining—others thought of those same days as things no longer of obligation, and rejoiced in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free. Each after his manner consulted his conscience and the Lord of his conscience. Well, says the Apostle, these things are perfectly matters of indifference. Let neither accuse the other. Let the one give his brother credit for delicacy of conscience—the other suppose his brother to be capable of throwing off restraint in some things, without cherishing a dislike for all restraints. Occasions may and do occur, when the strong-minded especially should avoid giving offence to the weak, and making a parade of his liberty. But the general rule is, "In non-necessariis *libertas*, in omnibus *caritas*." "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord, and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it."

In all this I can see no allusion, even of the most distant character, to the question, "Is there any day of obligation under Christianity, depending upon Apostolic usage?" Besides, it is the ordinary practice of the writers of Holy Scripture to look with a single eye to the point with which they are engaged, and to put out of sight for the moment all consideration whether their argument may or may not possibly be perverted. If holy days of all kinds were intended to be made unlawful or unnecessary under Christianity,

by these passages, such passages would certainly prove strange exceptions to the general character of the writings of inspired men. I cannot, therefore, agree with those, how respected soever their names may be, who adduce them as subversive of the doctrine that the Lord's Day is a positive institution of Christianity, and of an origin Apostolic, and so Divine. But I think it due to the maintainers of the opinion that the Lord's Day is a purely Ecclesiastical institution, to make a few more remarks, first, upon what is said in defence of it; and secondly, on the results to which it appears to lead.

It is said, then, that the observance of days is essentially Jewish, and therefore cannot be part of Christianity as it was intended to be. Therefore the Lord's Day must be an after-thought, and a human after-thought. This is of course a "petitio principii," but I think it worth while to quote in reference to it, the words of an eloquent writer, now alas! no longer a member of our Church:—"If (he says) it is a good argument against our Church system, that St. Paul denounces Judaism, surely it is not a worse argument against the Jewish system, that Moses denounces Paganism. If St. Paul says of Judaism, 'Let no man judge you in meat or in drink;' or, 'Ye observe days and months and times and years,' I suppose Moses says still more sternly of Paganism, 'Ye shall overthrow their altars, and break their pillars, and

burn their groves with fire.'—(Deut. xii. 3.) And if Moses adds the reason, as regards Paganism, viz. because they were dedicated to *false* gods; so does St. Paul give the reason, as regards Judaism, 'which are a *shadow* of things to come.' And (he continues) as the ordinances of the Jewish Church were not paid to false gods, though they were ordinances *like* the pagan; so those of the Christian are not a shadow, though they are ordinances *like* the Jewish." (Newman, "Sermons on Subjects of the Day," p. 241-2.)

It is said again, that no day (besides the Sabbath) was observed, so far as we can discover from Scripture, by the Apostles. This is, I think, contradicted by what has been urged in Lecture II.

It is said further, that, the Sabbath being declared to be abolished, we cannot, without recurrence to Judaism, acknowledge a continuance of it. This of course falls to the ground, if our position is correct, that the Lord's Day is not a continuance, in the strict sense of that word, of the Sabbath, but rests upon a foundation of its own.

It is said yet again, that, state the Lord's Day as you will, it must be as a particular day of obligation, in some sort a successor to the Sabbath, whereas the whole of the Christian's life here and hereafter is intended to be a perpetual *Sabbatismus*. He who wrote to the

Hebrews says this; and it is confirmed, on your own showing, by abundant testimonies from the Fathers. To this it may be replied, everything that can possibly be urged as to the Sabbatic character of the Christian's life, may be admitted: yet such admission is perfectly compatible with the doctrine, that upon certain parts or divisions of that life especial light may be thrown. Palestine was the Holy Land, but God chose an especial place, Mount Sion, which He loved, and called His Holy Hill. The Temple was all holy, yet was there a Holy of Holies within its precincts. Or, to take an analogy of a different character. It is true, for Christ has said it, that God may *now* be worshipped anywhere—that the place to which the tribes used to go up for worship, has no especial claims on the regards of the spiritual Israel. This does not, however, render it unlawful to dedicate certain places to His especial service, or to believe that His especial blessing is shed upon prayers offered therein.

It is said further, that to have especial times for religion, argues a low condition of religion; that it implies a state of things for which the Apostles were scarcely prepared and which they would be almost surprised to find still prevailing, were they to visit this lower world; that it is a declension from the first love of the Church, when such aids were not required; that it is in condescension to the weakness of human nature

that the Lord's Day exists at all; that it is a hindrance to what is to be desired, namely that religion should permeate the whole life, to concentrate it on certain days. To this it may be replied (we put out of sight for the moment our hypothesis that the Lord's Day *is* an Apostolical institution and *was* observed by the Church in the period of her first love), that the Apostles were practical men, well acquainted with human nature, in their brethren and in themselves; and that they may therefore well be supposed to have provided not for a Church κατ' εὐχήν merely, but for a Church κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν; that as to the Lord's Day being a condescension to the weakness of human nature, the whole Gospel is such a condescension; that as to religion being liable to be confined to one day, because one day is the Lord's Day, it would be as reasonable to urge that the spirit of prayer is likely to be lost throughout the remainder of the twenty-four hours, because we dedicate at morning, at evening, at noon-day, or perhaps oftener, certain especial portions of time to conscious communion with God.

It may be, besides, pertinently asked, if the Lord's Day be not Apostolic in such a sense as to be Scriptural and Divine, and so of obligation as part of the Christian's duty, when did the reverence for it spring up? The origin of other holy days we can trace in the Fathers, but we cannot trace them in Scripture. They may, if you please,

be considered of purely Ecclesiastical institution. But as for the Lord's Day, what formal document exists to prove that it was an after-thought, or established only because it was found after trial that Christians could not do without it? The Fathers do not speak thus concerning it. The earliest patristical notices that we possess concerning it, speak of it as an existing fact, as an integral part of the Christian's service. We demand, most justly, of those who advocate the Sabbatarian theory, their authority for asserting that the Sabbath was transferred to the Lord's Day. We may demand, as justly, of the maintainers of the other opinion, something like a shadow of evidence that it was discovered at some time that the Gospel could not grow without something subsidiary and adminicular to it—something that was not originally of it.

Such are some of the most usual assertions which are urged in support of the purely Ecclesiastical theory, and such are at any rate intimations of the way in which they may be met. On this latter head I may be permitted to say one word more. It is this: the theory is comparatively a modern one. It was adopted by the Romanists before the Reformation, from considerations stated in my Third Lecture. It was adopted by various Continental Reformers for reasons which I shall state in my Sixth Lecture. But, to come nearer home, it undoubtedly owed its appearance in the pages of such writers as

Bishop F. White and Dr. Heylin, and indeed of certain eminent writers of our own day, to a sort of reaction from Sabbatarianism. Men detected the fallacies of that theory, were impatient of the yoke which it imposed upon them, and without considering that they were perpetrating a similar fallacy, adopted a doctrine perilous in another way.

Logically stated, the doctrine which they had to oppose was this:

If the Fourth Commandment is binding, the Lord's Day is a Scriptural doctrine.

The Fourth Commandment is binding.

The Lord's Day is a Scriptural Doctrine.

Now they directed their whole strength to the disproof of the antecedent, or minor, and they were not unsuccessful. The conclusion therefore, so far as that argument was concerned, was left unproved, and practically fell to the ground. The effect on their own minds was that it was disproved, and that they were therefore bound to discover for the Lord's Day some other than a Scripture foundation, viz. an Ecclesiastical one. They might have directed their strength against the *consequentia*, and shown that the antecedent and consequent have no necessary connexion with each other. And they might then have found a new hypothesis which might have left the doctrine Scriptural, and yet freed it from the taint of Sabbatarianism. Their hypothesis might have been something like this:

If the Apostles' words and practice in Holy Scripture, and the evidence of the early Church, are to go for anything, the Lord's Day is a Divine and Apostolical institution.

Such is the ground which I have taken up in these Lectures; such, with some abatements, is the ground taken up by Archbishop Bramhall, and by the learned historian, Mosheim.

But I come next to examine certain results to which the purely Ecclesiastical theory seems to lead us.

And first, it can hardly fail to strike us that it involves, from the necessity of the case, an assertion not merely of the fallibility of the Apostles, but of the incompleteness of Scripture. I state this advisedly, having before me the language of some of its most distinguished advocates. "St. Paul" (says Dr. Arnold, Life, Vol. I. p. 320) "would have been utterly shocked, could he have foreseen that eighteen hundred years after Christianity had been in the world such an institution as the Sabbath would have been still needed." And again (Serm. xxii. Vol. III. p. 260): "It was intended that the Gospel should put us in a very different state, so that we should need the command no more. It was intended so, and St. Paul fully hoped that it would be so; and therefore he writes to the Colossians, 'Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow

of things to come; but the body is of Christ.' Such were his hopes for his fellow Christians, and to show that God designed them to be free from this Law, the command, in its letter, was kept no more; the seventh day, the Jews' Sabbath, was no longer observed by Christians. But St. Paul's hopes were disappointed, and the gracious designs of God were thwarted. The state of Christians was not changed; the old sickness was not thrown off: and therefore the old remedy was needed." The Lord's Day, then, if not contemplated by St. Paul, shows that his judgment was not infallible; that the Gospel, as he left it, was not sufficient; that an addition to Scripture was absolutely necessary. If so, not being supported by Scripture, it has no secure hold upon the conscience of a Christian man—it is not requisite or necessary to salvation. It must be supported, if at all, by other arguments, powerful indeed and persuasive (and no man knew better than Dr. Arnold how to state them, and most reverently he does state them), in combination with Scripture; but, apart from Scripture, likely to be of little weight against the voice which pleads incessantly in the corrupt heart, "Devote thyself entirely to the world."

Of course there is an escape from this argument. A person may say, "I do not add to Scripture by this theory, because I do not hold that the Lord's Day is binding on the conscience

of a Christian man. I consider it to be a matter of expediency, having been established originally by the judgment of the Ecclesiastical rulers of the Church, and of the Civil rulers of the world, and confirmed by the experience of eighteen centuries." How far this answer would have availed, let us say, before Constantine's edict was issued—*i.e.* before the rulers of the world took any notice of the Lord's Day—and whether it could have existed at all in the ages earlier still, when the eighteen centuries had just commenced, I leave you to determine. The escape, such as it is, only adds to the catalogue of what I cannot help terming the dangerous results of the purely Ecclesiastical theory.

But this same theory involves, again, a possibility of change of the day. (Indeed, as we are informed by Barclay, such a measure was at one time seriously contemplated by Calvin, and proposed by him to the magistrates of Geneva.) Dr. Heylin saw this, but endeavoured to obviate it by a distinction drawn from Suarez and others: "Absolutè quidem est mutabilis, practicè vero non est." Bishop Sanderson saw this, as is evident from his cautious expression, "the Church, (not to dispute what she may or may not do *in plenitudine potestatis*) ought not to attempt the altering of it to any other day of the week." Archbishop Whately saw this. It was a necessary result from his position that the Apostles possessed only the same power that

the later Church possesses, of ordaining rites and ceremonies and instituting religious festivals generally, and that they did not ordain the Lord's Day, in right of a higher power then possessed. Accordingly he can but deprecate any change, urge that "the reasons for the observance are the same, now, as in the times of the Apostles," and observe that "a man may have *a right* to do many things which he would *not be right* in doing." Now I fear that no methods of this kind would avail to prevent men from saying, "Qui habet institutionem, habet destitutionem;" or in other words, "If the Church made the first day holy, she may make any other day holy instead—she may change the cycle, she may enlarge it indefinitely, she may get rid of holy-days altogether." Our theory precludes any such result. The Sabbath, a positive Jewish institution, ordained of God through Moses, as shown in Scripture, remained in right of its Divine authorship till the dispensation passed away to which it belonged; then, prophecy being fulfilled, and express inspired declarations on the subject having been uttered, it passed away. The Lord's Day, a positive Christian institution, ordained of God through the Apostles, as indicated in Holy Scripture, remains in right of its Divine authorship until the dispensation to which it belongs shall pass away. Therefore it is immutable. The reasons for the observance which existed in the time of the Apostles, I do

not, with the Archbishop, consider to be a power, shared by their successors, "to enact regulations with a view to Christian edification, and amongst the rest, to set apart festival days, such as the Lord's Day, Christmas Day, Good Friday, Holy Thursday, etc.," but an inspiration peculiar to themselves, in virtue of which they established the Lord's Day as a positive and enduring Christian Festival, which only a similar inspiration, or a corresponding close of the dispensation to which it belongs, can abolish.

But this introduces another perilous result of the purely Ecclesiastical theory. As the Lord's Day was only an after-thought, and adopted as a remedial measure, it may, as the Church grows better, be dispensed with altogether. Even now we can imagine persons (identifying the Lord's Day with the Sabbath, and so classing it under things indifferent, and) saying, "There is such a thing as not regarding the day, and yet not regarding it to the Lord;" in a word, there is such a thing as "religious non-observance of the Sabbath; it is possible to attain such an elevation of spirituality as to be independent of stated days for religion altogether." Dr. Arnold saw that this was one of the natural results of the theory, and lifted up his voice earnestly against it, though he does not appear to have suspected the theory itself. But the late Mr. F. W. Robertson enunciated it and advocated it,

and repeated much that Dr. Arnold had advanced in favour of the theory. He pressed indeed the word *religious* very strongly, and showed the dangers of the corollary so clearly that one wonders he felt no misgiving. It is difficult to discover in what way the Christian who has thus embraced a religious non-observance of the Lord's Day, is to preserve any reverence for revealed religion at all—the Word and Sacraments, for instance—or how he is to stop short of the baldest natural religion.

Another result may be stated thus, "As it is obvious that on the Ecclesiastical theory, the existence of the Lord's Day implies a low state of religion, it is to be feared that its continuance will tend to perpetuate that low state, and that it is in fact actually injurious to it. It is to be hoped, therefore, that Sabbaths of every kind will soon pass away, or if the word be insisted upon, that Christians will arrive at the condition intended for them, one of continued Sabbatismus. Spiritual men do not want a Lord's Day; those who are not spiritual will not be improved by anything so poor and legal." It will scarcely have escaped your notice how singularly extremes have met. This is the very view, nay almost the very language, held by Antinomians and Anabaptists after the Reformation, and in one or two cases before it. Hengstenberg speaks strongly, but I do not think too strongly, on this point. "The notion that this want (*i. e.*

the want of fixed and periodical occasions on which all outward hindrances to the service of God are removed) only existed under the Old Testament, that because (in one sense) every day is a Sabbath to the Christian, the setting apart of certain days is only desirable for those who are merely outwardly members of the New Testament, but inwardly belong to the Old, will certainly find no advocate in the truly advanced Christian, but only in those who have been so absorbed in their *imaginary* self, as to lose sight of what they *really* are. The false spiritualism from which such assertions spring, is a worm which gnaws more destructively at our spiritual life than legality ever can. That which is true in theory is not always true without restrictions when put into practice by individuals; and this is more than ever the case in our day, whose impurities are so great, whose faith is so feeble, and whose seeking for holiness is so destitute of earnestness. If we were members of Christ, and nothing else, we should no longer require to set apart certain times; for our whole life would be an uninterrupted worship. But the flesh still exists in us as well as the spirit, and its strength is always so much the greater in proportion to our unconsciousness of its existence; and therefore, the louder and more confident a man's assertions that fixed times for assembling are superfluous, and the more he despises those who think them necessary, as

though they could not tell the signs of the times, the stronger the proof that *he* needs them still. For flying, something more is required than simply to fancy we have wings. He who is conscious that he has none, and pursues his pilgrimage humbly leaning upon his staff, will have made the greatest progress in the end. The continuance of sin in us brings with it always susceptibility to external impressions and to the influence of evil around us, together with wanderings of mind. The spark may fall on iron without danger, but not upon the tinder. For this reason, in order that we may pray without ceasing in a manner befitting our station, 'we must sometimes enter into our chamber, and shut the door behind us;' and in order to keep every day as a day to the Lord, we must keep one day free from everything that can disturb our devotion. Such disturbance arises most from our earthly employments."

Thus far this able and thoughtful writer. I have used his words in preference to any that I could myself furnish, because he probably wrote in ignorance of those to whose positions they might apply in England. It is scarcely necessary for me to say that I adopt them merely as descriptive of the tendency of the Ecclesiastical theory, and of the class of minds in which it is likely to find supporters, not at all of any individual theorist.

But I must now quit this branch of my sub-

ject, to consider the passage to which we have been tending all along. I mean that passage in the Hebrews which I selected as the text of the present Lecture:

"For if Jesus (Joshua) had given them rest, then would he not afterwards have spoken of another day.

"There remaineth therefore a rest (keeping of Sabbath) for the people of God."

Two very opposite conclusions have been drawn from these verses and their context:

First, There is evidently a Sabbath under Christianity, for it is said that there is "a keeping of it." A day is especially mentioned. This can only be the Lord's Day.

Second, There is evidently no Sabbath, *i.e.* no specially religious day under Christianity. The "day" mentioned is the Christian dispensation generally, not "the Lord's Day." Had the writer held such an institution to be a positive ordinance of Christianity, this would have been the place to say so.

I cannot quite agree with either of these conclusions, or with the reasonings by which they are brought out.

The argument of the passage taken as a whole seems to be this:

A rest or *κατάπαυσις* in Canaan, of which the Sabbath was a type, was promised to the Israelites. Many of the Israelites failed to enter into this rest, and though some, the children of those

who perished in the wilderness, did enter into it, the Sabbath did not thus receive its full antitype. There is yet a rest to be entered, the rest of God, who represents Himself as having entered into it, and as desirous of receiving into it all His faithful people. It exists, for the works on which it ensued were finished from the foundation of the world. [It exists; and observe that here is just the inverse of that argument of Christ in the Gospel. *There*, though God is at rest from the work of Creation, He is, so to speak, ever breaking His Great Sabbath, by the work of sustaining and regulating for good the course of what He has made. So it is with Christ, and so it may be with Christ's brethren. *Here*, though the Creator seems to be always working in the regulation of His Creation, He has entered into a rest from Creation itself, a Sabbatismus ineffable, unseen, eternal: Christ has entered into it likewise; and His people, though in the midst of this world's affairs, enjoy it after His pattern in some sort already, and shall enjoy it more perfectly hereafter. Of this, however, by the way.] It exists; but it was not manifested even in David's time. That ancient patriarch declared his belief in it, and at the same time, by looking forward to it, pronounced it to be a rest distinct from that of the land of Canaan, which he was personally enjoying, and which his ancestors had enjoyed since Joshua completed his conquests. Had the Sabbath received its full antitype in

Canaan, David would not have spoken of another "day," *i.e.* of a Dispensation distinct from the Mosaical, and on the promulgation of which the shadows of the Mosaical were necessarily to yield to realities. If the Sabbath, therefore, into which God entered after the Creation, is to receive its full development,—if that sign, the Jewish Sabbath, had a pregnant meaning,—if David's earnest expectation is to be realized,—if the true Joshua, having completed His works, has, as man's forerunner, entered into His rest, there remaineth a rest for the people of God. There remaineth a rest, as superior to that of Canaan as the spirit is to the letter, as the Gospel is to the Law, as the substance is to the shadow, as heaven is to earth. There remaineth (ἀπολείπεται) after every abatement for partial fulfilment of the Sabbath, a rest from sin, and from their own works which are sinful, to the people of God,—a rest, no longer to be called κατάπαυσις, which savours of time, but by a nobler title, σαββατισμὸς, which savours of eternity, and of Him who inhabiteth it. In it, what was dimly figured by the Sabbath is to receive its accomplishment. It is a rest, realized here inchoately by ceasing from evil works; hereafter absolutely, by ceasing from the works of this toilsome life, and seeing God as He is. This Gospel was in effect preached to the Jews. They understood it not through want of faith. This was shown by the failure of so many of them to realize the intermediate

fulfilment of the Sabbath by entering upon Canaan. Let us not fail, is the writer's practical conclusion, of entering into our better rest,—of enjoying heaven on earth, and of ascending from earth to heaven, through lack of earnest faith (*σπουδάσωμεν*).

Now if this be a correct statement of the argument, it will, I think, do very little in the way of proving either of the opinions given above.

For, if we directly connect the Sabbath with the Lord's Day (as some moderns have done, but no ancients that I can discover up to A.D. 500), we must make it either identical with it, or typical of it.

If we make it identical with the Lord's Day (though we can only do so by getting over the change from the Seventh Day to the First Day), then the Law had a positive institution belonging to it, which was *αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκὼν τῶν μελλόντων*, and not merely a *σκιὰ*, which seems to contradict a statement in Hebrews x. 1.

If we make it typical of the Lord's Day, then we contradict the passage now before us, in which the writer considers it (through the *κατάπαυσις* of Canaan), and he is followed in this view by the general consent of the ancients, to be a type of the *σαββατισμός* which remaineth for the people of God. He does indeed mention *a day*, but this does not surely refer to the Lord's Day, a periodically recurring festival, (this would make the antitype an unusually close

resemblance of the type), but to the dispensation introduced by Christ: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see *My day*, and he saw it and was glad." (John viii. 56.)

But while the passage is of no avail towards proving that the Sabbath, or anything homogeneous to it, exists under Christianity, it is as little capable of being fairly adduced to prove that there is no such positive Christian institution as the Lord's Day. It does not at all follow that because the writer has not mentioned the Lord's Day here, there was, and is to be, no institution of the kind. For he is speaking, be it observed, of the Sabbath, not as a religious, but as a typical ordinance; not as a continually recurring portion of man's earthly life, as compared with a continually recurring remainder, but as a standing admonition to the Jews—Firstly, that their dispensation was preparatory to a better; secondly, that man's visible and sensible life is not the whole or the better part of his existence. It would, therefore, have been out of place to mention the Lord's Day. One would, I think, have been surprised to find it mentioned here. Elsewhere it may be mentioned, and elsewhere, as I believe I have shown, it is mentioned. Because the Sabbath was a shadow, not of the Lord's Day, but of something else, it by no means follows that the Lord's Day fails of an Apostolic and Divine original.

But here, perhaps, I may be reminded that in

determining on what grounds the Lord's Day is binding upon us, we are to a certain extent limited by what the Church of England has laid down. Now that Church has said that "no Christian man is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called moral." The Catechism, which is intended to instruct us in faith and practice, deliberately refers us to the Ten Commandments, as spoken of God in the Twentieth Chapter of Exodus, as what we are to keep, in order to the fulfilment of our Baptismal obligation; and they are read in the Liturgy, whenever it is used, the congregation being bidden to say after each one of the first nine, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep *this* law;" and at the conclusion of the whole, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and write *all* these Thy laws in our hearts, we beseech Thee."

Well, I think we may grant all this, we may acknowledge our obligation (as expressed in the Article) to keep "the Commandments which are called moral;" but what does this bind us to? Simply to keep them so far forth as they are moral: so far forth as they are positive, *i. e.* concern the Jewish polity as a temporary dispensation, they are not binding upon us. For what says the Article again? "The Law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, does not bind Christian men, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity to be received into any commonwealth." The Fourth

Commandment, therefore, is to be kept so far forth as it is moral, not so far forth as it is positive. It is moral, in enjoining upon us the duty of some periodic devotion of ourselves to God's service. It is positive, in enjoining upon those who were subject to it aforetime, the seventh day, and a particular manner of observing that seventh day. And the positive part of it, as it is not binding upon us from the nature of the case, so it is not interpreted to be binding upon us by the authorized summary of our duty to God in the Catechism. For there we find not one word about the Seventh day, or the Sabbath day, but that we are to "serve God truly," (*τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν*, John iv. 24.) And in reference to this expression, it is worth while to record what took place at the Savoy Conference. The Presbyterians urged on that occasion, "We desire it may be advised upon, whether to the last word of this answer may not be added, 'particularly on the Lord's Day,' otherwise, there being nothing in all the answer that refers to the Fourth Commandment." This was not acceded to by the Episcopalians—"It is not true (they said in reply) that there is nothing in that answer which refers to the Fourth Commandment, for the last words of the answer do orderly relate to the last Commandment of the first Table, which is the Fourth." A sarcastic rejoinder was made to this, but the Episcopalians

were not moved by it. The Catechism remained as it was, not specifying the Lord's Day, which at that season of strife might have provoked contention from persons not disposed to be so moderate as the Presbyterian Commissioners, but what is more to our purpose, not inserting anything by which the Sabbath might be declared to be still binding. To "serve God truly," comprehended a religious worship analogous to that mentioned in the letter of the Commandment. And I do not think that we need hold that by the phrase "all the days of my life" was intended, by the Framers of the Catechism, such perpetual Sabbatismus as may dispense with any particular day as binding on the conscience. That phrase referred rather to the whole of our duty to God. We owe Him a life-long obedience in all the particulars mentioned. This seems to be the correct interpretation. First, because earlier in the Catechism we have similar phrases in reference to the whole of the Decalogue; "That I should keep God's holy will and commandments and walk in the same all the days of my life"—"That I may continue in the same to my life's end." Secondly, because at the end of the Duty to ones Neighbour there is a similar summing up, "And to do my duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me." Thirdly, because on no other supposition can we account for the silence of the Episcopalians when the Presbyterians urged, "And think you indeed

that the Fourth Commandment obligeth you no more to one day in seven, than equally *to all the days of* your life? This exposition may make us think that some are more serious than else we should have imagined, in praying after that Commandment, 'Lord have mercy upon us and incline our hearts to keep this law.'" They felt the unreasonableness and absurdity of the objection, and would not vouchsafe a reply. It was founded on a perverse appropriation to "serve Him truly," of a phrase which obviously belonged to the whole answer.

Our Church, therefore, would seem, while she directs us to regard whatever is moral in the Fourth Commandment, to permit us and even to direct us so far to spiritualize whatever is positive in it, as to substitute for the Sabbath, and the description of it and of the way in which it is to be observed, the Lord's Day and a description of it, and of the way in which it is to be observed, according to the genius of Christianity. We are nowhere told that we are to obey the Commandments called moral, *because* they are contained in the Decalogue. They are binding upon us *because* they are elements of the great natural law, written in our hearts at first, and authoritatively republished by Christ. We are nowhere told that the Decalogue is absolutely and in every respect moral; indeed, that opinion of Calvin seems to be a probable one, that it was intended to be a synopsis of the whole

Jewish Law of every kind, moral, ceremonial, political. Our Church seems to have considered it in like manner to be a synopsis, spiritually regarded, of the whole Law by which Christians are bound, both moral and positive, and without requiring us to accept it in its exact terms, to have placed it before us as a sufficiently convenient summary of all Christian duty. (Most of the expositors include every Christian duty, moral and positive, under its provisions, either in the spirit or in the letter.) Do what we will, place the Lord's Day on whatever grounds we please, (unless we adopt the fiction that the first day of the week was the actual seventh from the Creation,) we must spiritualize it in some way or other as we utter the prayer about keeping it. The Sabbatarian spiritualizes it in his peculiar way, *i.e.* by saying actually of the First Day, what was originally said of the Seventh Day. The man who holds the purely Ecclesiastical theory spiritualizes it in his way, or rather in a variety of ways which will be mentioned presently. He then does no strange thing, but Christianises the oldness of the letter, who, when he hears the Fourth Commandment rehearsed in his ears, thinks of the day hallowed by Christ's Resurrection, the birthday of the world to life and immortality, and desiring grace to observe it worthily, says, "Lord, have mercy upon me, and incline my heart to use rightly thine own day, the Lord's Day."

I shall not pause to consider the other reasons which may have influenced our Reformers in their insertion of the Decalogue into the Communion Service in 1552. They may have considered it to be desirable, now that confession to the priest was no longer made a matter of obligation, to preface the reception of the Holy Eucharist by a recital of the rule of God's Commandments, according to which men were to examine themselves. This would in itself be a deep and sufficient religious reason. It would recognise the truth that even at the moment when a man is about to enter upon the highest offices, and enjoy the highest spiritual blessing that he can enter upon or enjoy on earth, he may, for lack of self-examination, have the seeds of adultery, of murder, of blasphemy, in his heart, of which except he cast himself free by God's aid, he does nothing else but increase his condemnation by presenting himself at the Holy Table. It may be again, though this were a poor and transient reason, that they desired to bring the Second Commandment into notice as a protest against the remnants of idolatry. And it may be that they considered the insertion of the Decalogue to be necessary as a safeguard and silent protest against the purely Ecclesiastical theory of the Lord's Day, which we shall see was embraced by most of the Continental Reformers. Still less shall I apologise for the insertion, by attributing it to the influ-

ence of Valerandus Pollanus, or John a Lasco; or depreciate it by observing, that ours is the only national Liturgy in the world which has it (of course the Scotch and the American Liturgies are considered to be the same, though with slight variations); or defend it, by considering it, with Mr. Palmer, to be a *lesson* from the Old Testament, only invariable instead of variable, and broken by short prayers, an arrangement of which ancient examples are to be found. I am quite content to receive it, and to believe that he who uses the response in the sense that I have attached to it is in earnest before God and man.

And now I beg you to observe the striking features of this view. It no more binds us to the very words of this Commandment than the repetition of the same words after the Second bids us consider it a sin to cultivate statuary or painting, or after the Fifth to look forward to our days being long either on earth generally or in a literal Canaan.

It does not, by including all Church Holydays under the Commandment, diminish the singular honor due to the Lord's Day.

It does not so volatilize the Commandment as to consider it to be merely a general exhortation to a holy and contemplative spirit, which may end, such is the tendency of human nature, in neglect of a particular duty.

And lastly, it does not adopt the principle ably enunciated by Mr. Newman, but conceived

in the spirit of the ante-Reformation Schools, that the Lord's Day is the ceremonial Sabbath spiritualized; or in fact is *the* good thing of which the Sabbath was the σκιά.

But here, perhaps, it may be inquired, "Do you reject all Festivals and days of observance except the Lord's Day?" Indeed, I do nothing of the sort. This would be Puritanism itself. I only refuse to allow that they possess the same obligation that it possesses. The Lord's Day is of Scriptural indication and of Apostolical precedent. They are of ecclesiastical custom. It is Divine; they are human in their origin. It comes under the moral element of the Fourth Commandment, interpreted or supplemented evangelically; they come under the Fifth Commandment, which enjoins obedience to the lawful ordinances of Home, or State, or Church, or whatever has parental authority over us. It is invariable; they, being but ordinances of the Church, may be changed or abolished. And yet, so long as they remain (being not repugnant to the Word of God), they are to be observed. So the Queen is to be honored by her subjects. So the godly admonitions of his Ordinary are to be followed with a glad mind and will by a Clergyman. So parents are to be obeyed by their children. No, we may not reject these other days, of the use of which Hooker speaks so enthusiastically, but withal so really, in the Fifth Book of his immortal Polity; but we may

not argue with the Tridentine Catechism that, as other Jewish Festivals besides the Sabbath were covered by the Fourth Commandment, so other Christian Festivals besides Sunday may be covered by it, understood spiritually. Those other Jewish Festivals (I mean, of course, such as appear in the Pentateuch) were all of them of Divine institution, and thus were covered by the Sabbatical Commandment. But these other Christian days are confessedly of Ecclesiastical institution. An analogy for them must be sought in the Feast of Dedication, which depended for its origin and obligation on reverence to the Jewish Church, and on obedience to them who from time to time "sat in Moses' seat." So is it with all our Christian days except the Lord's Day. The Jews were to observe the Feast of Dedication. Christians are to observe these, lest they "offend against the common order of the Church, and hurt the authority of the Magistrate, and wound the consciences of the weak brethren."

To return, however, for a few minutes longer to our immediate point.

You will remember that even in the ante-Nicene period the Lord's Day was brought to the mind of men by various suggestions. One writer adopted one, and another writer another parabolic method of directing attention to it. They were not altogether uniform. So, in her form, perhaps, of reminding her children to keep

the Lord's Day by the parable of the Sabbath, the English Church may be peculiar. This may be readily allowed. But another circumstance must be noted at the same time. God speaks the parabolic word; the people accept the lesson contained under it; but not the exact terms of the parable itself. Except in the Decalogue, the word Sabbath does not occur in the Prayer Book; and the exposition of the Fourth Commandment has nothing Sabbatarian in it. Take these facts together, and what do they amount to? Not surely to anything like an admission that the Lord's Day is the Sabbath under another name, or that it is to be observed on the same grounds, or with the same commemorative recollections, or with the same earthly anticipations, or in the same punctilious manner, as was the last "Sabbath day of the law kept according to the Commandment" while Jesus lay in the grave; much less as was kept the Sabbath of tradition. It only implies that the following points, every one of them of some importance, were probably before the compilers of our Liturgy.

That the Apostles, directed as they no doubt were by the Spirit of God in their framing of ordinances for the Christian Church, carried out the moral part of the Fourth Commandment, which demands a periodic devotion of time to God's service, and inculcates, by the mysterious example of the Almighty Himself, the alternation of rest with labour.

That the same Apostles were directed in their choice of a cycle by the precedent of an analogous Jewish ordinance, now indeed abolished, but instituted originally by Him, who in the fulness of time brought about its abolition.

That it being admitted that the Resurrection day completed the work of our Redemption, grateful commemoration of that day, under Apostolic example, as immediately becomes due to Christ, from His being the agent in it, as the grateful observance of the Sabbath was due to God the Father, from His making that day the sign and earnest of entrance into the rest of Canaan.

That if the Jews were bound to commemorate their temporal mercies, *à fortiori* Christians are bound to commemorate their spiritual mercies.

That if a day of rest was useful and even necessary to the Jews, it was likely to be useful and even necessary to Christians.

The Reformers of the English Church even ventured in the Book of Homilies to call the Lord's Day the Christian Sabbath. This title of the day was unknown to early antiquity, and does not appear until we reach the twelfth century. But I do not think we need object to it, if we are careful to observe that the qualification of the word Sabbath points not to Moses but to Christ. It is a *Christian* Sabbath. We are not indeed bound to every

expression or sentence in the Homilies, but we approve of their doctrine generally as "wholesome" or sound. The following passage will show that they called the Lord's Day, a Sabbath, only by analogy or accommodation. "Albeit this (Fourth) Commandment of God doth not bind Christian people so straitly to observe the utter (external) ceremonies of the Sabbath day, as it was given to the Jews; as touching the forbearing of work and labour in time of great necessity, and as touching the precise keeping of the seventh day after the manner of the Jews; for we now keep the first day, which is the Sunday, and make that our Sabbath, that is, our day of rest, in honor of our Saviour Christ, who as upon that day rose from death, conquering the same most triumphantly; yet notwithstanding whatever is found in the commandment appertaining to the law of nature, as a thing most godly, most just, and most needful for the setting forth of God's glory, it ought to be retained and kept of all good Christian people." "Here needeth no gloss, observes Archbishop Bramhall, nothing can be more express than the Homily itself. 1. That the Fourth Commandment 'doth not bind Christians over strictly.' 2. Not 'to the external observances of the Sabbath.' 3. Not as it was given to the Jews. 4. Not as to the rigorous part of it to forbear all work. 5. Not as to the time, the first day of the week having

been justly substituted by Christians for the seventh. 6. Not as to the end; our end is to honor the resurrection of Christ. 7. And lastly, to speak once for all, the Fourth Commandment obligeth Christians no further than that part of it which appertaineth to the Law of Nature." He adds soon afterwards, in the same treatise, "This law of nature doth not extend itself expressly to any day, either natural or artificial, but only to a sufficient time. Whatsoever is more than this, proceedeth either from evangelical law or from human law." Human law he had already repudiated as the basis of the Lord's Day. It is based by him on evangelical law.

The Homily has not been quoted, as consistent with itself—for indeed it is not so—but only as a witness to the points which are insisted upon by Archbishop Bramhall. Perhaps, as there are various other points in the Homilies to which no one would now agree, as the assertion that there was a Pope Joan, or that the Holy Ghost spoke by the mouth of Tobit, there may be some facts misstated in this Homily, and in the warmth of its exhortations some language held which is not in accordance with that of the early Church. We are, however, concerned with what the English Church has deliberately said and done in her public offices, and fully authorized documents. She has said as little as possible,—and thus left us every liberty of

construing what she does say in accordance with Christian antiquity. Some may consider it to be an evil, but I rather consider it a blessing, that on a subject so important so little should have been said definitely. Some may desire the precision of the Jewish religion. I rather hold with Dr. Stanley, that the omission of particularity is one of the characteristics of the New Testament, and one of the strongest guarantees that the religion which it inculcates may be spread everywhere. The Lord's Day at the death of St. John presented the features of periodical assembling for prayer, thanksgiving, partaking in the Christian mysteries, and religious instruction. Charity to the brethren, and thoughts upon Divine things, were other employments of it. Nothing was *said* of rest; but rest, so far as those times admitted, from worldly employments was no doubt a feature of it, from the nature of Him whom they worshipped, from the necessity of the case, from the physical demands of the body, from the analogy of the Jewish law, from the example of the Creator,—considerations which the Apostles must have had before them when under Divine direction they observed a Lord's Day.

Such a Lord's Day as this, was, I think, contemplated by the Apostles, and observed by them and by the early Church, and intended to be adopted by the Church of England. At any rate, for reasons which I have given, I believe

the theory now set forth to be less exposed to objections than any other theory. My two next Lectures will enter upon the controversies which have beset the subject on the Continent and in England from the Reformation until now. And the last Lecture will be occupied with the Question, How shall the Lord's Day be so observed as to benefit man both in body and soul, until he pass

"To where beyond these voices there is peace."

LECTURE VI.

JEREMIAH V. 10.

GO YE UP UPON HER WALLS, AND DESTROY; BUT MAKE NOT A FULL END; TAKE AWAY HER BATTLEMENTS; FOR THEY ARE NOT THE LORD'S.

Ἀνάβητε ἐπὶ τοὺς προμαχῶνας αὐτῆς, καὶ κατασκάψατε, συντέλειαν δὲ οὐ μὴ ποιήσετε. ὑπολίπεσθε τα ὑποστηρίγματα αὐτῆς, ὅτι τοῦ Κυρίου εἰσίν.—Jer. v. 10: ex Vers. LXX.

GO YE UP UPON HER BATTLEMENTS, AND DESTROY; BUT MAKE NOT A FULL END; LEAVE HER UNDERWORKS; FOR THEY ARE THE LORD'S.

You will remember that at the conclusion of my Third Lecture I made this statement: "That the Reformation found the Lord's Day obscured by a sort of Sabbatarianism established on an Ecclesiastical foundation." I explained this to mean, that by the time that movement commenced, the Church of Rome, having forgotten the Apostolical and Divine origin of the Lord's Day and its singular claim to the regard of Christians, had surrounded it with a crowd of other days obviously of inferior claims to regard, and loaded both it and them with most vexatious restrictions. Having done this, she had found herself obliged to discover some sanction for them which should bind men's consciences. The attribute of infallibility indeed, which, in her view, invests with Divine authority what

we should call Ecclesiastical in the lower sense of the word, might have answered her purpose. She might, consistently enough, have rested on this only. But man's reasoning powers could not be entirely ignored, or his desire for something like Scripture precedent entirely repressed. Besides, it seemed a safer course not to exercise directly her assumed right of adding to the Word of God. The same object might be attained by accommodation of the enactments of the older dispensation to that of Christianity. The number of special days, and the observances provided for them, were such as already to exhibit a likeness to Judaism, and in fact were a conscious or unconscious imitation of Judaism. It was but one step further to lay down, formally, that Christian institutions were the legitimate and antitypical successors of those of the Jews, and, *mutatis mutandis*, to inculcate as far as possible, not merely the scriptural, but the traditional manner of observing Jewish institutions.

So far as the elaboration of a system went, the Church of Rome was perfectly successful. Christian men were thoroughly entangled in it, and if they tried to carry it out, to live it (so to speak), they were hampered at every turn. So far, however, as practice went, the strictness of the provisions supplied produced an effect the reverse of what was intended. Human nature rebelled against it. The days now made co-ordinate, or

nearly so, both as to origin and as to observance, with the Lord's Day, were either not kept at all as holy days (they were too numerous for that, compatibly with the business of life), or they became holidays of the worst kind, mere excuses for licentiousness. And the desecration of these involved with it the desecration of the Lord's Day. The multitude did not pause to make subtle distinctions. Perhaps the Lord's Day was even worse observed than the other days, for, in spite of the Church, men had a vague impression that it was one of specially allowed intermission of ordinary employments. This they interpreted to mean of more special permission of dissipation than the other days noted in the kalendar.

Irregular and partial protests about this state of things (which was the growth of centuries) had from time, as we have seen, been uttered. But it was reserved for the sixteenth century to witness a more general protest against the Church of Rome, both in this matter, and in other matters which need not be entered upon here. How that general protest affected the Lord's Day upon the Continent, what it did and what it omitted to do, to what causes such omission is to be traced, and with what lasting results it has been attended, and finally, what has been the state of feeling and practice on the subject from that time to the present, I propose to consider to-day. The contemporary history of England must be reserved for my next Lecture.

The text, which of course you will have surmised, is intended rather as a motto than as a text strictly so called, expresses negatively, at least, the manner in which the Continental Reformers dealt with the Lord's Day, especially if it is explained by the Version of the Seventy.

When viewed in combination with each other, the two Versions present the following ideas: Punishment and partial overthrow are pronounced by the Almighty against Jerusalem. The executioners of His wrath are desired to "go up upon the walls of that city and destroy." But their commission to destroy is limited by an accompanying caution; they are "not to make a full end." "Its battlements, indeed, are to be taken away, for they are not the Lord's," they have been added without His sanction—they are evidences that Judah has trusted rather to his own devices than to Him without whom "they who build the house do but lose their labour." But "its underworks (ὑποστηρίγματα) are to be left; these are the Lord's"—they were constructed with His sanction; and they are therefore intended to remain, both as a memorial of Him and as a basis for future defences. The meaning of course is, that while God would destroy whatever was sinful in Jewish practice, He would not at that time do away with the Jews as a nation.

The application of this to our purpose is

obvious. The Continental Reformers, generally, were persuaded, and we find no fault with them for this, that the time was come for purifying the Church of God, that great Christian Institution of which Jerusalem was a type, both in its calling and in its backsliding; both in its original construction by the guidance or permission of a Divine Artificer, and in its having had unauthorised and sinful additions made to it according to the devices of man. But they forgot, the majority of them at least, the limitations under which (and a canon for which is supplied in the text) all such reforms should be conducted. Hence, while sweeping away what was human in doctrine and practice, they trenched in various particulars upon what was Apostolical and Divine.

A multitude of instances crowd upon me, but I will only mention a few. The low views entertained by several foreign Protestant communions of the grace of Baptism and of the Holy Eucharist are cases painfully in point. If the Church of Rome had made the former of these a charm and condensed the latter into an idol, there were those who in their reforming zeal, and in the not unnatural reaction produced by a sense of liberty, reduced the one to a rite of initiation, the other to a mere metaphor. And so of other things. If Orders had been unscripturally multiplied, and Ordination and Confirmation raised to a dignity co-ordinate with

that of the "two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel;" if the doctrine of Penances and Indulgences had caricatured (I can use no weaker term) "the Power of the Keys," the commission "to bind and loose;" and if confession to the priest had been made of obligation; there were those who forgot what our own Church has righteously maintained and acted upon. I allude, of course, to such positions as that "from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;" that "God hath given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their sins"—and that it is "after the example of Christ's own Apostles that the bishops lay their hands upon those come to years of discretion, to certify them by that sign of His favor and gracious goodness towards them."

And so it was in reference to the Lord's Day. With one blow as it were, and with one consent, the Continental Reformers rejected the Legal or Jewish title which had been set up for it; the more than Jewish ceremonies and restrictions by which, in theory at least, it had been encumbered; the army of Holydays of obligation by which it had been surrounded. But they did more. They left standing no sanction for the Day itself which could commend itself powerfully to men's consciences. They did not per-

ceive that, through the Apostles, it was of the Lord's founding. They swept away together with the *upper-works* which *were not the Lord's*, the *under-works* which *were the Lord's*. And when they discovered that men, that human nature in fact, could not do without it, they adopted the Day, indeed, but with this reservation expressed or implied: "The Lord's Day is to be placed in the category of ordinances which, being matters of indifference, any 'particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change or abolish'"—or, which was worse still, they made it a purely civil institution, dependent if not for its origin, at least for its continuance, on the secular power. This was Brentzer's view.

Other causes have been suggested as having actuated the Continental Reformers in their adoption of low grounds for the observance of the Lord's Day. It has been said that "strongly as they believed and asserted that Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross was made once for all, and that no human sacrifice could render it more complete, they did not hold, practically at least, that it was a sacrifice for mankind, that the world was reconciled to God." In other words, that in consequence of denying the universality of the Atonement, they could not admit the divine claims of a Day on which "Christ risen" was proclaimed as the fountain of risen life for all. I do not indeed contend that this

feeling may not have had, though unconsciously to the holders, an operation upon some leading minds. It should, however, be remembered that the tenet of particular Redemption was far from being adopted everywhere, and that therefore it can scarcely be to this that a view held by the Continental Reformers generally is traceable. Again, decidedly as they were opposed to her theory, I could imagine the practice of the Church of Rome to have exercised a partial influence on them,—but I believe the real reason to be that of which I have spoken already.

Nor is this my own opinion merely. The well-known sentence in Luther's "Table Talk" exhibits both what the Continental Reformers feared, and the exaggerated tone in which they desired their followers to shun the apprehended danger. "If anywhere," he says, "the day is made holy for the mere day's sake,—if anywhere any one sets up its observance on a Jewish foundation, then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall remove this encroachment on Christian liberty." And Richard Baxter says, apologetically, "For Calvin, and Beza, and most of the great divines of the foreign Churches,—you must remember that they came newly out of Popery, and had seen the Lord's Day and a superabundance of other human holy-days imposed on the Churches to be ceremoniously observed, and they did not all of them so clearly

as they ought discern the difference between the Lord's Day and those Holy-days, or Church Festivals, and so did too promiscuously conjoin them in their reproofs of the burdens imposed on the Church. And it being the Papists' ceremoniousness, and their multitude of Festivals that stood altogether in their eye, it tempted them to too undistinguishing and unaccurate a reformation."

But let me now turn to my authorities.

The first that I shall quote is the "Larger Catechism" of Luther.

The comment which it offers on the Fourth Commandment begins by explaining the word Sabbath, with reference to its Hebrew meaning, to be a "*Feiertag*," "*dies feriandi seu vacandi à labore.*" It then goes on to speak thus:—"This precept, so far as its outward and carnal meaning is concerned, does not apply to us Christians. The Sabbath is an outward thing, like the other ordinances of the Old Testament, which were bound to certain modes, and persons, and times, and places, but are now all of them made free by Christ. But still, in order that we may gather for simple people some Christian meaning from this precept, understand what God requires of us therein in the following manner. We celebrate festivals, not for the sake of intelligent and instructed Christians, (for these have no need of them,) but first, even for the sake of the body. Nature herself teaches the lesson that the

working classes, servants, and maids are to be considered; they have spent the whole week in laborious employment, and require a day on which they may take breath from their work, and refresh themselves and restore their exhausted frames by repose. The second reason, and indeed the chief one, is this:—that on such day of rest (*an dem solchem Ruhetage—die Sabbati*), leisure and time may be obtained for divine worship, (a duty for which, otherwise, no opportunity could be found,) so that we may come together to hear and handle the Word of God, and further, that we may glorify God with hymns and psalms, with songs and prayers.

"It is, however, to be observed, that with us, this is not so tied to certain times in the way it was with the Jews, as that this or that day in particular should be ordered or enjoined for it. No day is better or more excellent than another. These duties ought to be performed every day. But the majority of mankind are so cumbered with business, that they could not be present at such assemblies. Some one day, therefore, at least, must be selected in each week for attention to these matters. And seeing that those who preceded us (*majores nostri*) chose the Lord's Day (*Sonntag—Dies Dominica*) for them, this harmless and admitted custom must not be readily changed; our objects in retaining it are, the securing of unanimity and consent of arrange-

ment, and the avoidance of the general confusion which would result from individual and unnecessary innovation."

The celebrated Confession read and signed at Augsburg, A.D. 1531, which was adopted by the whole body of "the Protestants" as their rule of faith, is my next authority. (This document owes its form to Melanchthon, though the matter of it was supplied by Luther, who during the diet was residing at Coburg, a town in the neighbourhood.) Its language is to the following effect: "Those who judge that in the place of the Sabbath the Lord's Day was instituted as a day to be necessarily observed, are greatly mistaken. Scripture abrogated the Sabbath, and teaches that all the Mosaic ceremonies may be omitted now that the Gospel is revealed. And yet, forasmuch as it was needful to appoint a certain day that the people might know when they ought to assemble together, it appears that the Church destined the Lord's Day for this purpose. This day seems to have the rather pleased them, in order that men might have thereby a proof of Christian liberty, and know that the observance whether of the Sabbath or of the other day was not a matter of necessity." It goes on to reprobate the discussions which have taken place, "about the change of the law, the ceremonies of the new law, the change of the Sabbath," which it attributes "to a false persuasion that the Church's worship ought to

be like the Levitical:". "Some," it says, "argue that the observance of the Lord's Day is not '*juris divini, sed quasi juris divini;*' and prescribe how far it is lawful to work on holidays. All these disputations, what are they but snares for consciences?"

A later edition of this Confession, put forth A.D. 1540, though it slightly varies the above statement, has nothing upon which I need dwell.

But to pass for a few minutes to individual writers.

Chemnitz (born A.D. 1522, died A.D. 1586), who has deservedly obtained a place among the more eminent followers of Luther, charged the Romanists with superstition, because they taught an inherent sanctity in the Lord's Day and other festivals; and while he would prohibit such labours as interfere with divine service, thought it "a Jewish leaven" to prohibit such as do not so interfere.

Bucer (born A.D. 1491, died A.D. 1550) wrote, as is well known, a book "Concerning the Kingdom of Christ," which he presented to King Edward the Sixth of England, as a New Year's gift. In it he referred to the miseries of Germany and the German reformation, and to the want of ecclesiastical discipline, the adoption of which he strongly recommended in England. This was to begin by a more careful refusal of the Eucharist to ill-livers, by the sanctification

of the Lord's Day, of holidays, and of days of fasting, which last he proposed should be more numerous and less confined to Lent, a season which had been popularly disregarded. And yet the man who wrote thus says, "To think that working on the Lord's Day is in itself a sin, is a superstition, and a denying of the grace of Christ."

Not less remarkable, if we may trust Heylin's account of the matter, was a statement made by Peter Martyr (born A.D. 1500, died A.D. 1562). A question had been put to him, why the old Seventh Day was not observed in the Christian Church. His reply was, "That on that day, and on all the other days, we ought to rest from our own works, the works of sin. But as to this day being chosen rather than that for God's public service, *that* Christ left to the liberty of the Church, to do therein what should seem most expedient." And further, "that the Church did very well, in that she did prefer the memory of the Resurrection, before the memory of the Creation."

I come now to the Heidelberg Catechism, which was drawn up by Ursinus, A.D. 1563, and was almost universally adopted by the Calvinist or Reformed section of the Continentals. It is curious on two accounts. First, as making the Fourth Commandment refer to the worship of God, and various matters connected with it, generally (*cum aliis, tum præcipuè festis diebus*),

without special mention of the Lord's Day; and, secondly, as supposing that it enjoins such a constant abstinence from sin as shall allow God to work His work in man's heart by His Holy Spirit, to the end that even in this life man may begin that never-ceasing Sabbath predicted by Isaiah.

The words of Calvin himself are much of the same character. The Sabbath is abrogated. This he asserts boldly. It was a typical and shadowy Ordinance which is required no longer, now that the antitype and substance thereof have been manifested. Yet it has given a hint in various matters to the Christian Church. That we rest constantly from our own works, and allow God to work His work in us; that we employ ourselves privately in meditating on God's work; and that we observe the lawful order appointed by the Church, for hearing the word, for ministration of the sacraments, for public prayer,—that we avoid oppressing those who are under us, whether our servants or our beasts of burthen. The seventh of our time, and in particular the first day of the week, seem to be indicated, the one as a convenient proportion of our life, and the other as the special portion. The provision made for the Jews points to the former—and ancient, even apostolic practice to the latter. But the proportion and the special portion, though the First Day be the Day of the Resurrection, are alike matters of indifference. He is particularly

severe on those who, in former ages, had imbued mankind with Jewish ideas, such as developed themselves in the assertion that, while the ceremonial part of the command, that is, the observance of the seventh day, was abolished, its moral part, which they stated to be the observance of one day in seven, remained. What is this, he says, but to insult the Jews by changing the day, while they imitate the Jews by observing one which they invest with the same sanctity? The result of their doctrine is, that they have gone thrice as far as the Jews themselves in a gross and carnal Sabbatism, and deserve Isaiah's reproaches on that subject even more than the Jews deserved them.

Thus far Calvin; and the Catechism of Geneva, and certain statements of Beza, his disciple, fully carry out his view. Much to the same purpose speaks the Helvetic Confession, drawn up A.D. 1566. This document premises, that religion is not bound to stated times, but that without due distinction of times it cannot be planted and fostered. On these two principles combined, each Church determines for itself a certain time for public prayer, for the preaching of the word, and for the celebration of the sacraments. It is not, however, left free to each individual to overturn the arrangement made by his Church in this behalf. And, sufficient leisure is a requisite to the maintenance of religion. Men would otherwise be drawn

away from it by the distractions of their worldly affairs. Then it goes to make this statement:—"Hence we see that in the Churches of old, from the very times of the Apostles, not merely were certain days in each week appointed for religious assemblies, but the Lord's Day itself was consecrated to that purpose and to holy rest. This practice our Churches retain for worship's sake and for charity's sake. But we do not thereby give countenance to Judaic observance or to superstition. We do not believe, either that one day is more sacred than another, or that mere rest is in itself pleasing to God. We keep a Lord's Day, not a Sabbath Day, by an unconstrained observance."

We are now, I think, in a condition to sum up the views of the Continental Reformers of the Sixteenth Century on the subject before us. Sabbatarians indeed those eminent men were not. They are utterly opposed to the literal application of the Fourth Commandment to the circumstances of Christians. They scarcely touch upon that Commandment, except to show that the Sabbath has passed away. So far they agree with the Ancient Church. But when we examine the manner in which they speak of the Lord's Day, we cannot help noticing a marked difference between them and the early Fathers. That simple assertion, "We observe the First Day, on which Christ rose from the dead," is never made by them as a matter of course, with-

out the slightest fear of its being called in question, and with no more doubt of its admissibility than attends anything else derived from the inspired Apostles. They feel it necessary to defend their practice, on grounds, sometimes perhaps of Apostolic example (with the proviso, however, that such example is to be taken only for what it is worth), but generally, of Antiquity, of the Church's will, of the Church's wisdom, of considerations of expediency, of regard to the weaker brethren, and sometimes on lower grounds still. And neither the day itself, nor the interval at which it recurs, is of obligation. Our Lord's Resurrection is made a decent excuse for the day, rather than the original reason, or one of the original reasons, of its institution. We miss also in their writings that close connexion of the Lord's Day with the Lord's Supper, which was prominently brought forward in early times. Therefore, to class together these writers and documents, and those of the Ancient Church, as similar, though distant links of a chain which is to prove the Lord's Day to be a purely Ecclesiastical institution, is, I feel persuaded, a fallacy and a snare. And it seems to me more than probable that the want of a deeper sanction for the observance of the Lord's Day than their teachers supplied, led the members both of the Protestant and of the Reformed Communions into a practical disregard of it, closely resembling that of the

Communion which they had indignantly disclaimed. It paved the way also, bye and bye, for a partial and temporary reception of Sabbatarianism—a doctrine which had this at least to say for itself, that, compared with the purely Ecclesiastical view, it traced the original of its weekly observance, though not to an inspired college of Apostles, yet to an inspired Lawgiver.

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, Dr. Bownd's work was published in England. What reception it experienced there we shall see afterwards. Suffice it to say at present, that the view which it inculcated, viz. the basing both the obligation and the observance of the Lord's Day directly on the Fourth Commandment, spread in a very short time from England to Holland. Certain Puritans who sought an asylum in Zealand were its original introducers. Then followed a maze of controversy, in threading which I thankfully accept the guidance of Hengstenberg. It was first put forth so as to attract notice in two works on Ethics, by Udemann in 1612, and then by Teelling in 1617. Mosheim speaks most respectfully of the latter of these two writers as a systematizer of the science of Christian morality, which Calvin and his associates had left in an imperfect state. Several ministers embraced the new opinions, (for new indeed they were), others retained those which they had inherited from the earlier Reformers.

The contest thus generated soon reached such a height that the Synod of Dort, which met A.D. 1618, could not help noticing it. It does not indeed, appear that the question was formally entertained until the Synod was virtually closed by the departure of "the Foreigners." But some supplementary Sessions were afterwards held. In these the practical neglect of the Lord's Day in Holland, which had scandalized the English divines, was recommended to the notice of "their High-Mightinesses the States General," that it might be "obviated and restrained by new ordinances and strict placards." It is curious to find that this resort to the secular power had been suggested by the English at the 148th Session, and especially by the English Bishop (Carlton of Llandaff), at the 14th Session of the Synod. An enquiry was made in what manner persons were compelled in other countries to go to church, and "keep the whole Sabbath as they ought?" He replied, "that in *his* country the civil magistrate set a fine, or pecuniary penalty, upon those who forebore coming to Divine Service, according to their duty;" and (he added with great *naïveté*), "that such fine wrought much more on the people than any the most pious exhortations." Of this by the way. To reconcile the contending theorists, certain "orders for the observation of the Lord's Day," were drawn up by the Divinity Professors, present at the Synod, with the con-

currence of the Clergy of Zealand, and read and approved. They run thus:—

1. In the *Fourth Commandment* of the Law of God, there is something *ceremonial*, and something *moral*.

2. The resting upon the seventh day after the creation, and the strict observation of it, which was particularly imposed upon the *Jewish* people, was the *ceremonial* part of that law.

3. But the *moral* part is, that a certain day be fixed and appropriated to the service of God, and as much rest as is necessary to that service and the holy meditation upon Him.

4. The *Jewish Sabbath* being abolished, Christians are obliged solemnly to keep holy the Lord's *Day*.

5. This Day has ever been observed by the ancient Catholic Church, from the time of the Apostles.

6. This Day ought to be appropriated to religion in such a manner as that we should abstain from all servile works at that time, excepting those of charity and necessity; as likewise from all such diversions as are contrary to religion.

Within the limits of these articles, which were indeed remarkably moderate, it was hoped that both parties might rest contented, until the "New National Synod" should take further cognizance of the matter. It failed, however, to produce any effect. The subject was of too domestic a character, and one of which men were too frequently

reminded, to be easily glossed over. The age was one which demanded definite statements on other matters—why should they be withheld on this? The ministers had begun the controversy. After their example the professors of nearly all the Academies in Holland engaged in it, and it was continued for almost a hundred years.

It is impossible to do more than allude to the principal combatants on either side. The celebrated Calvinist Gomarus was at the commencement of the contest the chief opponent of Sabbatarianism. In his *Examen Sabbati*, published A.D. 1628, he maintained that the Sabbath was first delivered to the Israelites in the desert, and was an institution of a ceremonial character. His position was that of Professor of Hebrew, and also of Theology, at Leyden. He was not unopposed either in his own university or elsewhere; Rivetus, and Walæus, both of them Theological Professors at Leyden, William Ames, an Englishman, but naturalized in Holland, and eventually Theological Professor at Franeker in Friesland, and Voëtius (sometime a student at Leyden), who held a similar office at Utrecht, wrote vigorously against portions of his views. At Leyden, and perhaps elsewhere, attempts were made to moderate between the parties. They may have partially succeeded, for there seems to have been a short lull of the storm, unless, as Herodotus says of

the storm off Cape Sepias, ἄλλως κως αὐτὸς ἐθέλων ἐκόπασε.

A few years afterwards the contest broke forth again. Two Theological Professors of Leyden, Heidanus and Cocceius, argued very strongly for the purely ecclesiastical origin and obligation of the Lord's Day. The latter of these seems to have entertained the strange view that "the Ten Commandments were promulgated by Moses not as a Rule of Obedience; but as a Representation of the Covenant of Grace." This of course made the Sabbath merely typical even under Judaism, and *à fortiori* typical under Christianity. Hoornbeeck, also a professor of Theology, opposed his colleagues, and the contest grew so hot at Leyden that the States General at length interfered. An edict was issued (Aug. 7, 1659), prohibiting any further discussion, and referring to the Six Articles of Dort as final. Whatever effect this measure may have had at Leyden, the subject was by no means suffered to rest elsewhere. At Utrecht, Essen attacked the line of argument taken by Cocceius; Francis Burmann supported that line, and applied to his antagonists a remark made by Augustine in writing to Jerome, concerning the ensnarers of the Galatians, "Dum volunt esse et Judæi et Christiani, nec Judæi nec Christiani esse potuerunt." Less courteous words than these were exchanged between them and their respective followers. At Groningen, the Professors of

Divinity and of Hebrew embraced different sides. The former, Maresius, or Des Marêts, agreed with Cocceius: the opinions of the latter, Alting, may be surmised from the facts that his enemies said that he needed nothing but circumcision to constitute him a Jew, and that he himself scarcely disguised his regret that he had not been submitted to that ordinance. After some further controversy, matters ended in an acquiescence in the purely Ecclesiastical view, on the part of nearly all the Reformed bodies on the Continent. But by this time the Eighteenth Century had commenced.

There is little doubt, I apprehend, that much of the attention which Sabbatarian views received in Holland is attributable to their appearing to be a refuge from the prevailing disregard of the Lord's Day. A similar yearning recommended them to earnest and thoughtful men in various parts of Germany, during a portion of the time of which we have been speaking. But here their spread was comparatively silent and gradual. Men held them perhaps privately, but it was a considerable time before any open promulgation of what was obviously opposed to their authorized Confessions of Faith was attempted. At length, however, they seem to have spread so widely as to demand public notice—and Fecht, a Lutheran divine and historian, of Rostock, wrote against them. This was in 1688. Still, in spite of the power and

learning which he employed, they gained ground daily. At Holstein we find them thoroughly in the ascendant by 1701. A translation of one of Francis Burmann's works had been published there. Judged by the standard of the Augsburg Confession it was strictly orthodox. But it was attacked by Schwartz, the general superintendent of the province, and declared by him to contain "false doctrine, and to be fraught with evil consequences to the land."

Mayer, the General Superintendent of the Churches in Pomerania, seems also to have espoused the Sabbatarian views about this time. In A.D. 1707, an able antagonist appeared against him in the person of John Samuel Stryk, a jurist of Halle, who had succeeded his father (also an eminent jurist) in the professorship of Law at that University. As those of the other side had become Sabbatarians through dislike of the prevailing licence on the Lord's Day, so this man adopted the purely Ecclesiastical view, from dislike of the Pharisaic strictness which the other view rendered obligatory. He had no doubt the best intentions, but his zeal against days and formalism carried him to a very dangerous extreme. He would allow the advanced Christian to be independent of the Lord's Day; such a man is above all ordinances; even the day itself might be changed, so purely is it a matter of indifference, if it seem good to the civil power. His work and that of Fecht, which he caused to be

reprinted, created a great sensation in Germany. A host of writers opposed it, so deeply rooted had Sabbatarianism become.

I might mention several writers, Buddæus of Jena, for instance, who upheld Mayer's view; but the name of Spener, who about A.D. 1680 founded one branch of the practical reformers called Pietists, deserves especial notice. He felt strongly on the moral obligation of the Jewish ordinance, but at the same time he valued quiet above controversy. It did not escape him that the Confession of Augsburg was decidedly against what he conscientiously held, and he had sufficient misgiving of the prudence of his partisans, to make him fear that the inculcation of too strict a theory would produce a reaction in practice. He preferred, as indeed did the great Scottish divine, Dr. Chalmers, long afterwards, to rest the argument for the Lord's Day on the experience of those who have tasted its blessedness. In fact, the eloquent words of the latter might have been used by Spener. "For the permanency of the Sabbath, we might argue its place in the decalogue, where it stands enshrined among the moralities of a rectitude that is immutable and everlasting; and we might argue the traditional homage and observancy in which it has been held since the days of the Apostles; and we might argue the undoubted and experimental fact, that where this day is best kept, there all the other graces of Christianity are in

most healthful exercise and preservation. But we rather waive, for the present, all these considerations; and would rest the perpetuity of the Sabbath law on this affirmation, that, while a day of unmeaning drudgery to the formalist, it is, to every real Christian, a day of holy and heavenly delight,—that he loves the law, and so has it graven on the tablet of his heart, with a power of sovereignty over his actions, which it never had when it was only engraven on a tablet of stone, or on the tablet of an outward revelation,—that, wherever there is a true principle of religion, the consecration of the Sabbath is felt, not as a bondage, but is felt to be the very beatitude of the soul,—and that, therefore, the keeping of it, instead of being to be viewed as a slavish exaction on the time and services of the outer man, is the direct and genuine fruit of a spiritual impulse on the best affections of the inner man."

One is loth to mar the effect of this passage by anything approaching to criticism. It is, however, obvious to remark, that the subjective argument, how valuable soever for the mutual comfort and edification of those who, already observing a duty, communicate with deep joy, each to his brother, "what God has done for his soul"—will hardly prevail with the gainsayer. And there is another grave fault in it. It is liable to lead to such a severance of action and feeling from principle, that if applied generally,

it would render us incapable "of giving an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us." Its extreme development is exhibited in that notorious line,

"He can't be wrong whose life is in the right,"

which if once adopted destroys whatever is objective, not merely in morality, but in theology.

The learned Mosheim, (Chancellor of Gottingen, died A.D. 1755) whose name I mentioned in my Fifth Lecture, coincided with neither of the two contending parties. He held that the Lord's Day and the Sabbath were perfectly distinct institutions, and that the latter, which was a peculiarity of Judaism, has entirely passed away. And he held also, that the Lord's Day is so thoroughly traceable to the Apostles, so proved by the universality of its prevalence, and the consistency of the testimony concerning it, to be an institution of their founding under inspired guidance, as to demand, *Jure Divino*, the observance of Christians. He supplied, therefore,—at least so it seems to me,—exactly the hold upon the conscience, in which the purely Ecclesiastical view is defective. He was, however, unsuccessful in the enforcement of the higher view upon his countrymen. The Sabbatarian view also has nearly died out in Germany. The prevalent notions among the Protestants there, as well as among the Reformed in other parts of the Continent, give little encouragement to it. Academical theses are constantly written upon the subject.

Several of these I have seen. They are generally in the purely Ecclesiastical direction. C. C. L. Franke, for instance, who wrote in 1826, is determined that he will find no trace of an Apostolic and Divine origin for Sunday. In particular he desires to get rid of the testimony borne to this fact by the phrase *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ*. His scholarship indeed will not allow him to change the arrangement of the words, or to tamper with the text, and with Augusti interpret the words of John's being spiritually in the day of Judgment; but he chooses, contrary to almost every authority, to refer it to Easter Day. And if this be not allowed, he is willing rather to give up the genuineness of the Book of the Revelation, and to attribute it to some unknown author at the end of the first century, than allow an Apostle to speak of the Lord's Day!

In closing my account of the manner in which the Lord's Day has been regarded or treated of on the Continent, I ought not to pass over the earnest and able man, whose treatise on the subject has supplied me with the groundwork of much that I have just now said, I mean E. W. Hengstenberg, Professor of Theology at Berlin. He belongs to what has been called the Evangelical section of the foreign Reformation.

His doctrine on the subject may be regarded in two aspects, the destructive, and the constructive aspect.

Destructively, nothing can be clearer than his statements, or more convincing than the manner in which he has substantiated them. The Sabbath does not depend upon the Creation words. It was a Jewish institution. The Ten Commandments are not exclusively a moral document. The Sabbath was not simply for rest, but for other high purposes. Our Lord did not abrogate it in so many words, but he virtually abrogated it, together with the remainder of the Law, by fulfilling all its commands and all that it signified. The Apostles declared its abrogation in express terms, and forbade any approach to reimposing its obligation. Nothing like a transfer of the obligation of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day took place, or could take place, without injury to the distinctive character of the New Testament.

The constructive portion of his system, though good in some respects, is neither so definite nor so satisfactory. What appeared in the Old Testament was God's revelation, and though fulfilled by Christ, and abrogated so far as the letter is concerned, seems still to be about and around the Christian Church, at any rate to the following extent: it is suggestive of the principle, that if similar wants exist—such, for instance, as that of periodic returns of a day of worship—they must be met in a similar, though more spiritual way. This is especially true of the manner in which the Sabbath suggested the Sunday. Not that Christ instituted the Sunday, or that His Apostles

instituted it, though no doubt they observed it from the earliest days of the Faith, (Scripture tells us this, and the historical testimony to it is so constant and so universal, that we can find no other origin for it); they had no more authority to do so than any one else had; they would not have ventured upon a step which appeared to contradict their own teaching. The observance of the day arose from the spontaneous feeling, by which nations, however unconnected, commemorate events in the history of their Founder. This feeling was especially strong in the Apostles, who were intimate with the Founder of the Church; but their example in this matter is useful to us, not as an inspired authority, but as an evidence of the truth and genuineness of the Christian feeling from which the observance sprung. The same feeling was further developed in other festivals, the observance of which rests on the same basis as that of Sunday. The only difference is that the benefits conferred by Him whose day Sunday is, and consummated on that day, are greater than any others which can be stated or even imagined. And we retain the day chosen by the Apostles, on the same principle, or rather on the same spontaneous feeling, which dictated its selection. Christ is still the same Saviour, and His Resurrection, the climax of the whole work of redemption, must have the same importance for us, as for those who saw Him, when risen, with their bodily eyes. In one sense,

perhaps, the Lord's Day is a Divine institution. The Spirit guided and overruled what men thought was their spontaneous feeling. The Church, that is, universal Christendom, cannot have gone wrong in the selection of her day of worship; and its existence as a day of worship, necessitates its further character as a day of rest. It belongs to all, for all need it in both its characters, the holiest, as well as those furthest from God. Besides, by its possession of the "semper, ubique, et ab omnibus" qualification, or at least so far forth as it possesses it, (though this of course is a modern argument), the Lord's Day has even a stronger claim upon men's regard now, than it had in the days of the Apostles. By the observance of it we enter into the closest fellowship with the whole Christian Church of the present and the past; and the consciousness of this fellowship must of necessity exert a lively influence on our devotion.

This is what Hengstenberg offers us as a plea for the Lord's Day. One cannot help regretting that he did not localize, so to speak, the superintending influence which he acknowledges dictated the institution, in the Apostolic men, whose practice, as in many other things, so in this, seems at once to have been inspired, and to be binding on the Church for ever.

It is curious, however, to find that even the inadequate views entertained by this writer do not prevent his being anxious to promote prac-

tically the observance of the Lord's Day. He is most anxious for this, and thus he refutes the assertion that those only care for it who hold the Sabbatarian opinions; and there are other points connected with his treatise which deserve notice. He is convinced that the Sabbatarian view is unsound; he condemns such recent German writers on the subject as take that view, (Oschwald for instance entirely, and Liebetrut partially), for inculcating it; he believes that as that view came originally from England, so certain Sabbatarian efforts which are now being made in Lower Saxony, come from England also, and, theoretically, are much to be deprecated; and he supposes that England holds dogmatically the Sabbatarian view. But what is the foundation of this last supposition? He fancies the Kirk of Scotland and the Church of England to be perfectly at one on this subject, and his ideas of our theology in general are derived from Dr. Dwight the American—an author who, whatever be his excellences, certainly wrote in a superficial manner, and without much acquaintance with antiquity, on the Lord's Day.

With all this, Hengstenberg somewhat admires our English Sunday. He sees, that despite of the dogmatical view which he attributes to the English, the Lord's Day is more what it should be amongst them, than it is in Germany and the greater part of the Continent—where opinions

prevail more nearly in accordance with his own.

How far he is right in attributing what he does attribute to the English Church, we shall see bye and bye. Whether he be right or wrong, he is at any rate not singular in so doing. Olshausen says incidentally (on Romans xiv. 5, 6), "An Old Testament observance of the Sabbath, such, for example, as prevails in England, is, according to this passage, surely not that which is objectively correct." The Chevalier Bunsen is more discriminating. But he complains that some persons in the English and Scottish Churches maintain that what is really a "relapse into Jewish ceremonial, and an unchristian interruption of congregational and social life," is "a divine institution binding upon all Christians." He adds, that they should be "contented with defending a wise and free popular custom, which may be, within certain limits, a necessary *correctio* for many people, as Christian and moral in the idea." These persons are "amiable in other respects;" but "Judaism remains Judaism, and is both foreign and in opposition to the Gospel." His own view, as indeed he declares in so many words, is in accordance with that of Hengstenberg. Meanwhile, it is worth remarking that there seems to exist at present, not merely in Germany, but in other parts of the Continent, at least here and there, a longing for something like the English Sunday. This, however,

is connected in some cases with Sabbatarian views, despite of the testimony which nearly every language of the Continent affords to the difference between the Sabbath and the Sunday, by the names of the two days: in other cases, as among the Romanists, with false miracles, that of "Notre Dame de la Salette" for instance, rebuking "la violation du Dimanche," or with a garbled version of the Fourth Commandment, in order to enforce the observance of the day by sanctions belonging to a distinct institution. "Le Dimanche tu sanctifieras," which agrees with a French metrical version of the Decalogue, is the burden and, indeed, the text of a tract by the Abbé Mullois, chief domestic Chaplain to the French Emperor; and he evidently assumes that the command was given in this exact form amid the thunderings and lightnings of Sinai. Germany, this writer considers to be in a better condition than France, so far at least as abstinence from labour on the Lord's Day is concerned; and he rejoices to be able to point to the good example set recently even in Paris by the suspension of the public works for the junction of the Tuileries to the Louvre on that Holy Day. But words fail him in his attempts to describe his abhorrence of "the selfish, criminal, and lewd Sunday, without heart and without pity" (un Dimanche égoiste, scélérat et débraillé, sans cœur et sans pitié,) which prevails in France generally, or to implore with sufficient

urgency the reestablishment among his countrymen of "a respectable, beneficent, and humane Sunday." And then he points to England—"You allege," he exclaims, "the demands of commerce, of arts and manufactures. The English, I suppose, have no commerce; those poor people, no concern with arts and manufactures! Aye, but indeed they have. Their business transactions are enormous; yet they do no work on the Lord's Day. Look at the banks of the Thames. There are wharves and dockyards extending leagues in length; and on week-days they are covered with a mass of workmen. The Lord's Day arrives. All these workmen rest; and not a blow of the axe is given."

Of course I quote this description of an English Sunday, simply as an indication that there is, on the Continent, a yearning for something higher and better, in observance at least, than the periodical return, to a large portion of the people, of mere dissipation, and than, to another large part, the existence of seven days' unbroken toil. The French clergy seem really exerting themselves to promote a better observance of the Lord's Day, and an association exists in Paris, with branches in many towns of France, for this laudable object. Even the Pope has been induced to sanction the movement, by a Brief given under "the ring of the Fisherman," and dated December 22, 1854. The document is indeed of a thoroughly Romish character, and excites the zeal of the faithful

rather by "indulgences," than by the desire to promote God's glory. And the publications of the association are many of them strongly tinctured with expediency or with Judaism. Still even this is a great step in a nation which in A.D. 1793 abolished the Lord's Day, and (though speedily obliged to find a substitute for it, by a tenth-day intermission of labour) did not restore it till A.D. 1802. Ten years these without the Lord's Day, and, it is to be feared, without the Lord!

The Abbé Gaume, Vicaire Général de Nevers, has written some interesting letters on the profanation of the Lord's Day in France. His style is very earnest, and one cannot help sympathising with him in many of his remarks. But his foundation is sadly insecure. He assumes that the Sabbath was communicated to man in the beginning, and that, after having been enforced from Sinai, and urged throughout Jewish history, it is identified in some unexplained manner with the law of the Lord's Day now. Putting this aside, it is instructive to find him arguing that all the revolutions and troubles which France has gone through for these seventy years are owing to neglect of the Lord's Day. And in answer to the economical argument, that to observe it would be a ruinous waste of one seventh of man's existence, he appeals confidently to the condition of England and of the United States. "Put the case at the very

lowest, those countries are not the worse; their commerce, their marine, their industry, their agriculture are not impaired by the regard they pay to 'le jour sacré du repos.' " (Voyez l'Angleterre et les États-Unis. Parce qu'ils continuent de témoigner le respect le plus édifiant pour le jour sacré du repos, ces deux peuples, auxquels nous ne le cédons sous aucun autre rapport, en sont-ils moins les deux rois de la fortune et de l'opulence? Leur commerce est-il moins florissant que le nôtre? leur marine moins puissante et moins belle? leur industrie moins avancée? leur agriculture moins intelligente? leur bien-être moins générale et moins solide? Si le câdre vous paraît trop restreint, parcourez l'Europe entière, et j'ose de nouveau défier tous les chercheurs de citer un seul homme, une seule famille, une seule province, une seule nation, que la sanctification du dimanche ait appauvrie ou empêchée de s'enrichir.)

In another part of his work, this writer gives a too flattering account of an English Sunday, and wishes that he could see the like of it in his own country.

Still these are only partial and ill-directed efforts; so ill-directed that they sometimes stir up the zeal of persons on the other side. (Louis Victor Mellet, the pastor of Yvorne, in the Pyrenees, has written against what he calls Sabbatism, and adopted instead of it the most extreme Ecclesiastical theory of Sunday.) Some time, it is to

be feared, must elapse before any great and visible change takes place. The majority of the Continental population cares little for the first day of the week as the Lord's Day. Romanists and those who differ from Rome are alike obnoxious to the charge of lightness in this matter. Paris, as we know, shows few signs of religion on Sunday, beyond the morning Mass (in spite of the exception just mentioned). In Spain and Portugal, multitudes rush, on Sunday, from the confessional to the bull-fight. In Reformed Geneva it is, I understand, a fact that though for a long time plays were altogether forbidden, even in private houses, they are now freely permitted in theatres, and on Sundays. And as to Protestant Sweden, it is not more than three years ago that evidence was given in a trial before Lord Campbell, that on Sunday bills are presented and counting-houses open, and business transacted as usual. Towards the end, too, of the legislative session, the Diet sits frequently on Sunday, and after the morning service, the clergy are seen going in their robes to the hall where it is held.

To what may much of this be traced? In the case of the Church of Rome, I believe to the fact that she has, in order to raise other festivals in estimation, lowered the Lord's Day to a mere Church ordinance, and having done so, is unable to induce her members to consider it anything but a Church Day, or more binding on their consciences than many of her

indefensible ordinances. She still teaches her children the Catechism drawn up by Bellarmine, and sanctioned by the Bulls of Clement the Eighth, A.D. 1558, and of Benedict the Thirteenth, A.D. 1728. That document, I should inform you, travesties the Fourth Commandment thus, "Remember to keep holy the festivals," (Ricordati di sanctificare le Feste), placing every other festival on an equality with the Lord's Day; and by the existence of more festivals than can possibly be observed, produces an irreverent use of all. Having thus lowered the Lord's Day, in vain does the Catechism afterwards enjoin, among "the few Commandments which the Church has added to the Commandments of God" (quelli pochi, che ha aggiunto la Santa Chiesa), that men should "hear Mass every Sunday, and on all other appointed festivals" (Udir la Messa tutti le Domeniche, ed altre Feste comandate). In the case of those who disagree with Rome, I believe that the indifference with which their Reformers spoke of the obligation to observe any one day in particular, has issued in a disregard of the particular day which they chose. It is Luther's day. It is Calvin's day. It is the day which the former adopted out of consideration to the multitude; the day which the latter, after some hesitation, preferred for expediency's sake to Thursday. *This* it is; but it is not the Day of the Lord,—that on which His Humanity had its triumph; which, if the indications of Scripture and the

practice and language of the Apostles and of the early Church are to have weight with us, is the Day of Praise of God, and of Love to man; and which, bringing Christian (not Jewish) Rest in its train, refreshes the whole man, body and soul and spirit; which is the People's Day because it is the Lord's Day.

LECTURE VII.

JEREMIAH VI. 16.

STAND YE IN THE WAYS, AND SEE, AND ASK FOR THE OLD PATHS, WHERE IS THE GOOD WAY, AND WALK THEREIN, AND YE SHALL FIND REST FOR YOUR SOULS.

Στῆτε ἐπὶ ταῖς ὁδοῖς καὶ ἴδετε, καὶ ἐρωτήσατε τρίβους Κυρίου αἰωνίους· καὶ ἴδετε ποία ἐστιν ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀγαθὴ, καὶ βαδίσατε ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ εὑρήσετε ἁγνισμὸν (*v. l.* ἁγιασμὸν) ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν.

(Conf. Matt. ii. 29, καὶ εὑρήσετε ἀνάπανσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν.)

Our inquiries have at length brought us to England. We will suppose ourselves to-day to be tracing the stream of thought and practice amongst us, in reference to the Lord's Day, from the Reformation to the present time. Not that we can allude, even by name, to more than a few of the writers on the subject, or touch upon any but the most striking events connected with it. We may, however, be able to exhibit in a compendious form a succession of facts, the careful consideration of which may lead us to some practical conclusion.

Some important questions present themselves.

Is it possible to discover, in the fully authorised documents of the English Church, such definite statements about the Lord's Day as will favour decidedly, either the Sunday-Sabbatarian view on the one hand, or the purely Ecclesiastical view on the other?

Is it possible to frame such a *Catena* of writers in the English Church, as will, by the number of its links and the solidity of each link, serve as an adequate interpretation of those documents in one direction or the other?

If neither of these courses is possible, should not the acknowledged moderation of the English Church be an element in the discovery of her view? And may we not interpret her by antiquity, to which she has ever had regard?

Certain cognate questions, will, by God's permission, be discussed in the concluding Lecture.

Something has been said already to the effect that Sunday-Sabbatarianism at any rate is not authoritatively sanctioned by the Church of England. For this I may perhaps refer you to the latter part of my Fifth Lecture. Nor is what was stated there invalidated by the existence of the document usually styled the Westminster Confession, which was drawn up A.D. 1643. It was indeed examined and approved A.D. 1647 by the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, and ratified by Scottish Acts of Parliament A.D. 1649 and 1690. But it had nothing

to do with England except during the abnormal period of the Great Rebellion, and was, *de facto*, ignored by the Savoy Conference. Its language is as follows:—"As it is of the law of nature that in general a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God, so, in His word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual Commandment, binding all men, in all ages, He hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto Him; which, from the beginning of the world to the Resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and from the Resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's Day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath. This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest *all the day* from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations; but are also taken up the *whole* time in public and private exercises of His worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy."

On the Continent this is frequently supposed to be our view. I confidently assert that it is not ours. It may have been, indeed it was, derived from the *English Puritans*, but it was not derived from the *English Church*. Their influence carried it into Scotland. In Scotland

it found a congenial soil; took root and became eventually the predominant view. Thenceforward it belonged to Scotland, where it was developed in a most exaggerated form, as the Records of the Kirk Sessions may show. (And as little is the Church of England concerned in the statements made by the Westminster Assembly in the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, both of which were adopted by the Kirk of Scotland A.D. 1648. I need not quote them here, for they are little more than the Confession itself exhibited in a catechetical shape.) It is obvious at first sight how strong is the contrast presented by the reckless historical assertions of the Confession, and by its particular designation of the things demanded or forbidden on the Lord's Day, to the simplicity of the Church of England. She asserts indeed practically, by her prepared services, that "a due proportion of time is to be set apart for the worship of God. And accidentally, because the first day in seven is one in seven, and is shadowed forth by her presentation of the Fourth Commandment to the people, she appears to speak of one day in seven. But, apart from this, there is scarcely a proposition contained in the Confession which finds a counterpart in her fully authorised documents. For instance, she nowhere lays down—

That from the beginning, one day in seven was particularly appointed to be kept holy unto God, or

That from the beginning of the world to the Resurrection of Christ this was the last day of the week, or

That from the Resurrection of Christ this was *changed* to the first day of the week, or

That the Lord's Day is the Christian Sabbath, except perhaps metaphorically.

Much less has she so ignored the compound nature of man, as to pronounce—

That the *whole* time of a man on the Lord's Day is to be taken up in public and private exercises of God's worship, and in works of necessity and mercy, to the exclusion of recreation for mind and body.

The utmost that she has done in this direction has been, as we have said, to present the Commandments to the people in the Jewish form, as a convenient summary of duty, qualifying that presentation by the Seventh Article of Religion. She has also inserted them in the Church Catechism; but the comment with which they are there accompanied does not bear the slightest resemblance to the Westminster Confession.

This latter fact, however, has been employed as an argument the other way. Some have held it to indicate at least a leaning to the purely Ecclesiastical view; to imply, that is, that Sundays and other Holy days stand exactly upon the same ground; that no higher sanction is possessed by the former than belongs to the latter; and that whatever belongs to the for-

mer is possessed by the latter in the same measure. It is urged that the Lord's Day is not mentioned in our Catechism—but it seems to have been forgotten that the inspiration of Holy Scripture is not mentioned in our Articles —and that therefore the argument from omission may perhaps prove too much. Both the inspiration of Holy Scripture and the obligation of the Lord's Day, though beset with difficulties of man's devising, may have been taken for facts in Christianity, and so not specially alluded to. (Thus, as we saw in the Third Lecture, even the Great Council of Nicæa only noticed the Lord's Day in order to regulate a perfectly indifferent matter, the bodily posture of the worshipper, during the continuance of its Services.) All were agreed as to the fact of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, however widely they might differ as to the mode in which it was effected, or as to the degree to which it was extended. So, all or nearly all, were agreed as to the fact of the Lord's Day being obligatory in some way or other, though they might have serious differences as to the ground of its obligation, or as to the exact manner in which it should be observed.

But in truth, neither the argument just noticed, nor another which I am about to notice, is at all conclusive for the purely Ecclesiastical view. Our Church, it is said, has a Table of proper Lessons for the Sundays and other Holy days throughout the year, therefore

she regards both classes in the same light. But if so, how is it, I reply, that she immediately proceeds to separate the classes? How is it that the selections from the Bible are arranged in order for the former merely? How is it that no Apocryphal Lesson is admitted on the Lord's Day? And how can we possibly compare the Festival of the Resurrection which occurs once in a week, with a collection of Festivals each of which occurs only once in a year? It is surely a gross fallacy to consider Sunday as merely *one* among the Festivals; it is *one repeated fifty-two times*, while the others have a single celebration. Besides, if mentioning Sundays and other Holy days together brings the former to the level of the latter, then Wednesdays and Fridays are also equal to Sundays, for on all these three days the Litany is appointed to be used. A mere rubrical direction, therefore, originating in a certain resemblance of services, is scarcely sufficient to prove, that the days to which it refers have all of them the same claim to our regard. And what though it is said in the Thirteenth Canon, "All manner of persons within the Church of England shall from henceforth celebrate and keep the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, and other Holy Days, according to God's will and pleasure, and the orders of the Church of England prescribed in that behalf"? A circumstance which occurred at the Savoy Conference explains beyond all controversy how that Canon

should be understood, and with it the heading of the Table of Lessons. The Presbyterian objectors to the Prayer Book had made the following demand:—"That if any [Saints' Days] be retained, they may be called *Festivals*, and not Holy Days, nor be made equal with the Lord's Day, nor have any peculiar service appointed for them, nor the people be upon such days forced wholly to abstain from work." The reply was this—"The observation of Saints' Days is not as of Divine, but of Ecclesiastical institution;" an expression which of course implies that in the judgment of those who last reviewed our formularies, that of the Lord's Day *is* of Divine institution. It is curious also, that the reply goes on to say, that on the Saints' Days, "the people may be dispensed with for their work, after the Service, as Authority pleases." No hint of a like dispensation occurs in reference to the Lord's Day.

We are warranted then, I think, in concluding that so far as her fully authorized documents are concerned, the Church of England does not pronounce in favor either of the purely Ecclesiastical or of the Sunday-Sabbatarian view of the Lord's Day. Not of the former, for the day is of Divine institution. Not of the latter, for though she presents the parable of the Jewish law as a reminder that the Sunday is of Divine institution, she does not assert that the Sabbath is continued. So far as those documents are con-

cerned we seem to be justified in "standing in the ways, and seeing, and asking for the old paths, where is the good way, and walking therein," if haply thereby, we may "find rest for our souls."

But in defect of a clear statement in favor of either extreme by the Church of England herself, can we not frame such a *Catena* of writers belonging to her Communion as may prove that she was always understood to lean to one or to the other? This would not indeed amount to a demonstration, but it would amount to a high probability as to what her leaning is.

I prepared you in some sort in my First Lecture, for a negative answer to this question, both by the variety of views which I mentioned and by the great names which I attached to them. No such *Catena* can be fairly framed. I proceed now to illustrate this assertion, throwing what I shall have to say into the form of a continuous narrative.

At the commencement of the Reformation no doubt the Ecclesiastico-Sabbatarian view was the one most prevalent in England. This is evident both from "The Institution of a Christian Man," and from another work termed "A necessary Doctrine and Erudition of any Christian Man," set forth respectively, A.D. 1535 and 1543. But this is little to be wondered at. The Church was in a state of transition, and had not yet thoroughly emancipated itself from the traditions of the Roman Schools. For, let us

observe the vague manner in which they speak. "The Sabbath is abolished in its literal sense." "St. Augustine is an authority for making a difference between the Fourth Commandment and the remaining nine." "The only points now binding in that Commandment are the ceasing at certain times from bodily labour, and the giving our minds wholly and entirely to God." "Instead of the Sabbath Day succeedeth the Sunday, and many other holy and feastful days which the Church hath ordained from time to time, which be called holidays, not because one day is more acceptable to God than another, or of itself is more holy than another, but because the Church has ordained that upon those days we should give ourselves wholly without any impediment unto such holy works as be before expressed." "Notwithstanding . . . . it is not meant but that in time of necessity we may upon the holy day give ourselves to labour, . . . but as commonly is used, to pass the time either in idleness, in gluttony, in riot, or in plays . . . . is not according to the intent and meaning of the Commandment, but after the usage and custom of the Jews, and doth not please God." Here is exactly what Rome did. The day is with other days set upon an Ecclesiastical foundation; and yet directions for the observance of it, and of other days coordinate with it, in order to develop the supposed spirit of the Fourth Commandment, are laid down. How far, putting aside for a

moment the character of these positions, the documents in which they occur are to be considered binding on our Church still may be judged from this fact. Those documents also "entreat of the institution, the virtue, and the right use of the Seven Sacraments, and of Purgatory." To us, then, they are mere historical monuments of the opinions of those who drew them up.

The sentiments of Tyndale, the first translator of the Scriptures into modern English, and of his friend and fellow-sufferer John Fryth, were of the Ecclesiastical character. But those worthy Reformers were influenced rather by animosity against the Roman Schools than by conformity with them. "As for the Sabbath (says the former), we be lords over the Sabbath, and yet change it into Monday, or into any other day as we see need, or may make every tenth day holy day only, if we see cause why. Neither was there any cause to change it from the Saturday, but to put a difference between ourselves and the Jews; neither need we any holy day at all, if the people might be taught without it." It is curious to find Tyndale foreshadowing the Decade of the French Revolution, and also, whilst he agrees with Calvin as to man's right to select any day in the week, urging against Calvin, that the first day was chosen in contradistinction to the Jewish Day. Fryth is even more explicit than Tyndale. Those who super-

stitiously observe Sunday are "much madder" than the Jews who superstitiously observe Saturday. "The Jews have the Word of God for their Saturday, sith it is the seventh day, and they were commanded to keep the seventh day solemn. And we have not the Word of God for us, but rather against us; for we keep not the seventh day, as the Jews do, but the first, which is not commanded by God's law." This is a remarkable admission, and if it fell into the hands of earnest men, with a "zeal not after knowledge," was likely to produce the inquiry, "ought not the Sabbath which God appears to command to be observed either in the spirit or in the letter?" It did produce this inquiry. One extreme was the precursor of the other.

The language of Cranmer, both in his Catechism of A.D. 1548, and in his "Confutation of Unwritten Verities" (if indeed it be his), shows that he was not in the slightest degree inclined to the Sabbatarian view. The former document makes "the Sunday and other days to be appointments of the magistrates, whom in this thing we ought to obey." The latter states that "the Church has ordained the Sunday." And the Book of Prayer set forth in the last year of Henry VIII., while it curtails the Fourth Commandment into "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath Day," seems after the Romish method to consider Sundays and all other holy days to come under it, and to de-

mand equal reverence. It has a Confession, enumerating violations of each of the Commandments, and, in reference to the Fourth, the sinner states, as in the presence of the Almighty, "I have not sanctified the Holy Days with works that be acceptable to Thee."

One cannot note this diversity, which a glance at the index of the works published by the Parker Society would increase twenty-fold, without a feeling of thankfulness that we are not bound as the Kirk of Scotland is, or as Foreign Communions consider themselves to be, by elaborate catechisms, or by the writings of individual Reformers. The sort of half authority which our Homilies possess, has proved in some instances a source of embarrassment. There are passages in them which cite the Apocrypha as inspired Scripture, and call other Ordinances Sacraments than the two spoken of in our Articles. How greatly would such embarrassment have been increased, did we owe allegiance to the individual opinions of men who were feeling their way out of Rome, and struggling after truth amid various difficulties!

The injunctions of Edward VI., Archbishop Cranmer's Visitation Articles of A.D. 1547, and the Act of the 5th and 6th of Edward VI., A.D. 1552, must be understood rather as correctives of the Ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism of Romish observance, than as enactments to be rested on, or as indications of the final judgment of the

English Church. Therefore, I do not concern myself as Heylin does, so to reconcile the last of them with the contemporary insertion of the Commandments in the Liturgy, as to argue that other Holy days beside the Lord's Day were included by the Church under the responsive petition annexed to the Fourth Commandment. Thus much only I should argue, that the coincidence of the two documents in point of time proves that no Sabbatarian doctrine was covertly insinuated by the insertion of the Commandment and the petition. The Act was occupied with the outer observance of holy days in general; the Liturgy with an inward and religious concern, with the establishment of something like a Divine authority for the one day, or at least a hint of it, under the parable, as we have called it, of the precept in the Decalogue.

I spoke just now of Scotland, and quoted the document which is, in the present day, considered to be the standard of the Kirk. It is worth remarking that before that standard was adopted, another was in existence, *the Confession*, drawn up by John Knox in A.D. 1560. The sixteenth chapter of this has for its heading, "What works are reputed good before God?" And in the body of the chapter is the following explanation of the First Table of the Decalogue. "We confess and acknowledge that God has given to man His holy Law, in which are not only forbidden all such works as displease and

offend His Godly Majesty, but also are commanded all such as please Him, and as He hath promised to reward. And these works be of two sorts; the one are done to the honor of God, the other to the profit of our neighbours; and both have the revealed Word of God for their assurance. To have one God, to worship and honor Him; to call upon Him in all our troubles; to reverence His holy Name; to hear His word; to believe the same; to communicate with His holy Sacraments, are the works of the first table." So far John Knox. There is in this document, you will notice, not the slightest allusion to the Sabbath, or to the Sabbatarian observance of any day whatever. A sort of strictness in reference to Sunday occurs in the "Book of Discipline," set forth A.D. 1561; but it is obvious that its provisions relate principally to the circumstances of Towns. And though Pocklington observes that in a letter to Calvin, signed by Whittingham and Knox, in the "Troubles at Frankfort," the word *Sabbath* is used for Sunday, he must be admitted to have made too much of the circumstance. *Sunday* is the word generally employed in that document, and no question appears to be raised either on its name or on its obligation. On the whole, whatever the language held at present in Scotland may be, it is certainly not owing to the great man whom the Scotch regard as the Apostle of the Reformation in their country. Of the practice

of Knox, Randolph, the English Ambassador, writing to Cecil, in November 30, A.D. 1562, has a few passing words:—"Upon Sunday, at night, the Duke supped with Mr. Knox, where the Duke desired I should be." This was after the ratification of the "Book of Discipline." Knox was the intimate friend of Calvin — visited Calvin, and, it is said, on one occasion found him enjoying the recreation of bowls on Sunday. He himself ministered at Geneva at intervals for four or five years (A.D. 1555—1559). The opinions of Calvin were, as I showed in the Sixth Lecture, anything but Sabbatarian. It has been said, that the disputes at Frankfort, which Knox encouraged, were the origin of Liturgical Dissent. This is true, but he did not carry his Dissent in the direction of the Sabbath.

But to return to England. Practically, the observance of Sunday was in a very unsatisfactory state throughout the reign of Elizabeth (A.D. 1558—1603). There seems to have been a great forgetfulness of its religious character. In one of the Queen's Injunctions Sunday is classed with other holidays, and it is expressly said, that "if for any scrupulosity or grudge of conscience some should superstitiously abstain from working on those days, they shall grievously offend." In fact, labour was almost enjoined after common prayer. On the same principle, we find the Queen "granting a license to one John

Seconton, to use certain plays and games upon nine several Sundays." After a time, in A.D. 1580, the London magistracy obtained from her an interdiction of this practice on Sundays within the liberties of the City. Elsewhere it was carried on; and the pictures of the Sunday recreations of the period which have come down to us, though somewhat profusely colored, indicate a low tone of feeling on the subject of the Holy Day.

Meanwhile the state of theology in reference to it was equally unsatisfactory. The chief writers against the prevalent desecration of Sunday were not found among persons who represented the moderate and reserved view, which I suppose the Church to have advisedly entertained. A new sect had sprung up, whose members were called sometimes Precisians, sometimes Disciplinarians, but more generally Puritans. From them proceeded the strongest protests on the subject. They were shocked at the forgetfulness of God which manifested itself at all times and on the Lord's own day especially. The Government, political, social, and ecclesiastical, under which it existed must evidently be unsound. Was there any remedy for it? They took the Bible into their hands, and decided that in it they would find a model of the true polity. And in particular, they decided that in it they would find a model for God's worship, superior to any thing visible, and yet applicable to the present

hour. Perhaps there was not exactly what they wanted, but there was something like it. A confusion already existed of the Sunday and the Sabbath. The former word did not occur in Scripture; it had a rather heathenish sound. The latter word did occur in Scripture, and in that part of it which men knew, if they knew nothing else, the Ten Commandments. Its observance was enforced under the Jewish system, in one case certainly, by a notorious and present judgment. Neglect of it was spoken of by the Jewish Prophets as the crying sin of the nation. The Old Testament was, by the admission of the Church of England, not contrary to the New Testament. This they interpreted to imply that it was identical with the New in all respects. Whatever is to be received and believed was to be found in Holy Scripture; this, again, the Church of England confessed. Sunday, under some name or other, they felt was to be received and believed. They did not find it in Scripture under that name, but they found a good deal about the Sabbath. Therefore, the Sabbath was to be enforced as a Scripture doctrine.

Of course some difficulties had to be got over. The Sabbath was the seventh day, Sunday was the first day of the week. But an ingenious theory that one day in seven was the essence of the Fourth Commandment speedily reconciled them to this. St. Paul had objected to Sabbaths. No doubt he had; but surely this was only to the

Jewish aspect of them, or only to the annual Sabbaths of the Jews; and then the Fourth Commandment might be construed to mean that the Sabbath existed before it was regulated by Moses. This Sabbath might remain, the adventitious elements being laid aside. It might have been given, it was given to man in Paradise, before the fall, and so was a primeval institution anterior to the Mosaic law. All obstacles vanished before these zealous men. It was nothing to them that the New Testament distinguished the Lord's Day from the Sabbath. Nothing that the early Church either declared the Sabbath to be abolished, or if it observed it at all, observed it as a continuation of Friday, or as a preparation for Sunday. Nothing that the early Church never appealed to the Fourth Commandment as a ground for observing Sunday. Nothing that it asserted that the ante-Mosaic patriarchs pleased God without the observance and without the knowledge of the Sabbath. All this they either ignored or were ignorant of. Every mention of a septenary division of time was tortured into a sanction of their theory. And a phrase in the fourth chapter of Genesis, "in the process of time," or "at the end of days," was presumed to imply the Sabbath Day.

There was another strange inconsistency in their system. They quoted our Lord's observance of the Sabbath. But, in doing so, they forgot two very important points. First, that He does

not appear to have proscribed or declined personally, innocent recreation or social converse upon it. Secondly, that, so far as He corrected the prevailing way of keeping it, it was by moderating, not by enhancing, its strictness. The natural inference from these two points would have been this: "Granting, for argument's sake, that Sunday and the Sabbath are identical, yet, by our Lord's own example, greater liberty attaches to the day of rest than we are disposed to concede." This inference they did not draw.

Such were, in general, the statements and tenets of the Puritans respecting the Lord's Day, which were floating about the nation during the reign of Elizabeth. Their favourite appellation of it was *The Sabbath*. *Sunday* was almost proscribed, as savouring of heathenism. Not indeed that this feeling was universal. Many who were well educated, and not blinded by religious prejudice, knew perfectly well how to distinguish the two words. Shakspere, no mean exponent of the proprieties of English phraseology, puts into the mouth of the *Jew*, Shylock,

> "And by our holy *Sabbath* have I sworn;"

but he makes Hamlet say, as a *Christian*,

> "Why such impress of shipwrights, whose sore task
> Doth not divide the *Sunday* from the week?"

The Puritans abolished this distinction. The name Lord's Day, however, occurs very frequently, and we find it even in "the form of discipline considered by the brethren in solemn synod, with the

several decrees thereof, in A.D. 1582." Grindal, who was Archbishop of Canterbury from A.D. 1575 to 1583, was favorable to their general views. So was Sandys, the other metropolitan, who had succeeded Grindal, first at London and then at York. (He died in A.D. 1588.) Both of them had been among the number of Marian exiles, and both of them, in their banishment, had espoused the Church side, in opposition to Knox. But both of them, especially the former, had become tinctured with what was afterwards called Puritanism, and belonged to the party which, in Dr. Arnold's words, "desired to carry the Reformation further."

Dr. Pocklington calls the year A.D. 1554 (the date of Knox's and Whittingham's letter) "the year of the Sabbath's nativity," but asserts "that it was full thirty years before the children (of Knox, Whittingham, and their fellows) could turn their tongues from Sunday to hit upon Sabbath." This brings us to A.D. 1584, the first full year of Whitgift's primacy at Canterbury. But many writers had advocated Puritanism in general, and Sabbatarianism in particular, before that time. Judgments were said to follow on the desecration of "the Sabbath Day," and that phrase, sometimes, though seldom, crept into public documents. Eleven years later, A.D. 1595, Dr. Bownd's book reduced Sabbatarianism to a system. His main propositions, as given by Fuller, are these:—

1. That the commandment of sanctifying every seventh day, as in the Mosaical decalogue, is moral and perpetual.

2. That whereas all other things in the Jewish Church were taken away, (priesthood, sacrifices, sacraments) this Sabbath was so changed that it still remaineth.

3. That there is great reason why we Christians should take ourselves as straitly bound to rest upon the Lord's Day as the Jews were upon their Sabbath; for seeing it is one of the moral commandments it bindeth us as well as them, for they are all of equal authority.

4. The rest upon this day must be a notable and singular rest, a most careful, exact, and precise rest, after another manner than men are accustomed.

5. Scholars on that day are not to study the liberal arts, nor lawyers to consult the case, nor peruse men's evidences.

6. Serjeants, apparitors, and sumners [are] to be restrained from executing their offices.

7. Justices [are] not to examine causes for the conservation of the peace.

8. Ringing of more bells than one on that day is not to be justified.

9. No solemn feasts nor wedding dinners [are] to be made on that day. (I omit the remainder of Fuller's description of this Ninth Article, for, as Mr. Brewer observes, it does not do justice to Dr. Bownd.)

10. All honest recreations and pleasures, lawful on other days, (as shooting, fencing, bowling) [are] on this day to be forborne.

11. No man [is] to speak or talk of pleasures or any other worldly matter.

A more particular statement of his positions is given by Dr. Bownd himself, in the preface to his work. We find from it that he held that the ante-Mosaic patriarchs were acquainted with the Sabbath. One does not find fault with the tone of the book, it is amiable; or with its intention, it was an excellent one. But two great errors pervade it. It is incorrect in its historical account of the origin of Sunday—and it deals too much with rules, too little with broad principles of Sunday observance. Hence, like every book of mere rules, it provoked a burdensome multiplication of rules for cases not provided for. And its assertion, that the command to observe *the Sabbath* is moral in the same sense that other commands in the Decalogue are moral, led, as we shall see presently, to misunderstandings of the most absurd character. Still, as we have said, the intention of the book was an excellent one. The desecration of Sunday which prevailed, seems to have been most appalling. Perhaps the words of the Homily, written some thirty-five years before, are not too strong to express it: "God was more dishonored, and the Devil better served on the Sunday, than upon all the days in the week beside." Dr. Bownd's

book was designed to counteract such desecration, and it produced in many parts of the kingdom well nigh a revolution in outward practice. "It is almost incredible, (says Fuller), how taking this doctrine was, partly because of its own purity, and partly for the eminent piety of such persons as maintained it; so that the Lord's Day, especially in corporations, began to be precisely kept, men becoming a law to themselves, forbearing such sports as yet by statute permitted—yea, many rejoicing at their own restraint herein."

It did not, indeed, escape animadversion. Archbishop Whitgift condemned it in his synods and visitations, called in whatever copies he could lay his hands on, and forbade it to be reprinted. This was in A.D. 1599. Lord Chief Justice Popham did the same in A.D. 1600. Its language in reference to the other festivals occasioned the thirteenth Canon of A.D. 1603, and various severities were exercised towards those who adopted its tenets, which drove them to Holland or elsewhere. And if the immediate results of it were those mentioned by Strype, no wonder that the authorities, ecclesiastical and civil, put into operation the various methods of discouraging its adherents which at that time were employed without scruple.

"It was preached in Oxfordshire, (says that writer) that to do any work on the Sabbath was as great a sin as to kill or to commit adultery.

It was preached in Somersetshire, that to throw a bowl on the Sabbath Day was as great a sin as to commit murder. It was preached in Norfolk, that to make a feast or wedding dinner on that day was as great a sin as for a father to take a knife and cut his son's throat. It was preached in Suffolk, (and my author saith that he could name the man,) that to ring more bells than one on the Lord's Day, to call the people to Church, was as great a sin as to do an act of murder."

It is probable, however, that these extravagances did not develop themselves at once. The tendency of the positions contained in the book would not have been discovered directly—and it would have taken some time to carry out the tyranny of the inquisition into private life, in which it eventuated, and which an able opponent of it called "more than either kingly or popely." "Learned men," says Fuller, "were much divided about these Sabbatarian doctrines: some embraced them as ancient truths, consonant to Scripture, long disused and neglected, now seasonably revived for the increase of piety; others conceived them grounded on a wrong bottom, but because they tended to the manifest advance of religion it was a pity to oppose them, seeing none have just reason to complain, being deceived to their own good; but a third sort flatly fell out with these positions, as galling men's necks with a Jewish yoke, against the

liberty of Christians; that Christ, as Lord of the Sabbath, had removed the rigour thereof, and allowed men lawful recreation; that this doctrine put an unequal lustre on the Sunday, on set purpose to eclipse all other holy days, to the derogation of the authority of the Church; that this strict observance was set up out of faction, to be a character of difference, to brand all for libertines who did not entertain it."

One cannot but feel somewhat surprised, that Hooker, generally so clear, is to a certain extent inexact in his statements on such a subject, and at such a time. I ventured in my Fourth Lecture to make some remarks upon this fact. I will only add here that the first Four Books of his Polity came out in A.D. 1592, before Dr. Bownd's performance appeared; that the Fifth Book came out in A.D. 1597, before it was fully known, at least in its dangerous aspect; that he was more concerned in defending the theory of other holy days, and of the Church system generally, which were speculatively assailed, than the Lord's Day, which, though practically disregarded, was in some way or other speculatively acknowledged; and that, had he gone out of the way to discuss the obligation of the Lord's Day separately, he might have appeared to symbolize with those who urged that other holy days were unlawful. This is somewhat confirmed by his language in B.V. 70. 9. "The rest (remainder) of the Festivals, they (the Puritans) say we ought to

abolish, because the continuance of them doth nourish wicked superstition in the minds of men, besides, they are all abused by the Papists, the enemies of God, yea certain of them, as Easter or Pentecost even by the Jews." It is perilous to differ from such a man, but I still presume to suggest the following considerations. That his supposition that St. Paul, when writing to the Galatians, meant Sabbaths in the Jewish aspect exclusively, is unsupported by antiquity. That he has not shown how the obligation to observe one day in seven is moral in the primary sense of that word, or, if the morality of that obligation is proved by the appearance of the seventh day in the commandment, how the Sabbath may be changed in the day and manner of observance. And finally, that he has no support from antiquity for his assertion, that the Church had a right to change, or did change the day and manner of observance. Thus much, however, is satisfactory in what he says. He gives no such minute instructions for keeping the Lord's Day as can interfere with Christian liberty.

Whitgift was scarcely dead, (his death occurred in A.D. 1604), when a new and enlarged edition of Dr. Bownd's book was issued, in A.D. 1606. For a good while, as Fuller quaintly expresses it, "not so much as a feather of a quill in print did wag against him." And Heylin says, "that in a very little time it grew the most bewitching

error, the most popular deceit, that had ever been set on foot in the Church of England." Abbot, who occupied Canterbury after the short tenure of Bancroft, was by no means disposed to use very harsh measures. And those who really discerned the unsoundness of the doctrines in vogue, were probably of opinion that it was as well to take advantage of whatever good they might produce, and trust to time for the elimination of the evil. But in A.D. 1618, King James, in one of his progresses in Lancashire, had it represented to him that the people were greatly dissatisfied with the curtailment of the rude amusements on Sundays and holy days to which they had been accustomed. Their education had scarcely prepared them for anything better, and they found time hang heavily on their hands. He accordingly issued what was called "the Book of Sports," by which persons were allowed after church-time on Sundays, to cultivate athletic games, and pursue such pastimes as were not in themselves unlawful. This document, which was in the form of a declaration, was to be read by clergymen during the Church Service. This was not, however, very generally enforced. Abbot refused to allow it to be read at Croydon, and it was at length silently dropped. It was, so it seems to me, most faulty in principle. By its enumeration of things permitted, it gave occasion to the same minute casuistry, as the enumeration of

things forbidden had produced on the other side. But the *animus* which had dictated the issue of the Book of Sports continued more or less in action, and contributed to carry out that remarkable emigration to America of the men whom we generally call "the Pilgrim Fathers." As long ago as A.D. 1607, various Independents had fled from England to Holland, finding their non-conformity expose them to hardships. Here they set up what they termed "the Pilgrim Church." But they found themselves losing their nationality, and, though not persecuted, were in danger, so they expressed it, of being corrupted by the world around them. A division of them accordingly set out from Leyden, in A.D. 1620, having been joined by some of those who objected to the Book of Sports. The observance of the Lord's Day in Holland was no more satisfactory to them than that which was now obtruded upon their brethren in England. They were, in fact, Puritans of the most austere cast. Literal interpreters of such parts of the Old Testament as they chose to consider binding upon them in consequence of the absolute morality of the Fourth Commandment, they were distressed at finding their views controverted in this particular. They allowed indeed Sunday to be substituted for the Sabbath, but the Judaism of their views would allow no more. And with the Sabbath, which they could not help seeing was the great sign between

God and His people, under Judaism, and was intimately connected with the Jewish polity, they thought themselves bound to re-introduce, so far as they could, all such positive enactments of the older covenant, as Christianity did not appear on the very surface to contradict. To erect a similar commonwealth, and with it, to re-establish "the Sabbath" in its integrity, these men had originally quitted England.

To obtain, I say, a freer development of their opinions, they quitted Holland in A.D. 1620, and went to New Plymouth. In imitation of them a larger body left the mother country in A.D. 1629, for Massachusetts Bay. One cannot help greatly respecting these sufferers for conscience' sake. It is with no slight interest that the log-book, for so it may be called, of the religious voyage of the good ship "May-Flower," which carried out the earlier adventurers, is perused. And the artist yet loves to dwell on the parting from Delph-haven, when Robinson, their pastor, knelt down on the shore and prayed with and for those whom he was to see in this world no more. The records of the second emigration are not so minute, but there is much in them to mov our feelings, even at the distance of two centuries and a half. The charm, however, somewhat vanishes, on our discovering that "the tyranny which they feared under the Book of Sports" was exercised unsparingly to members of their own body. "I came from England, said a sturdy

Puritan named William Blackstone, because I did not like the Lord-Bishops: and I cannot join with you, because I would not be under the Lord-Brethren." Here is a specimen of it, in the form of rules said to have been drawn up by John Cotton, a minister who had emigrated from Boston in Lincolnshire, and to have been intended as a draft of the laws of the Colony of Massachusetts.

"Whosoever shall profane the Lord's Day by doing unnecessary work, by unnecessary travelling, or by sports and recreations, he or they who so transgress shall forfeit forty shillings, or be publicly whipped; but if it shall appear to have been done presumptuously, such person or persons shall be put to death, or otherwise severely punished at the discretion of the court.

"No one shall run on the Sabbath Day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere except reverently to and from meeting.

"No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave on the Sabbath Day."

There is more of the same sort, which I omit as unsuitable for quotation here.

This document I believe to be a genuine one. The first of the three ordinances is unquestionably so, *totidem verbis*. The second and third represent the spirit, if not the exact form, of Puritan legislation. The parallel which it offers to other Judaic documents, such as those of

Pharisaism, or Rabbinism, or theoretic Romanism, is only too obvious. "Let no man judge you in respect of the Sabbath days," seems to have been indeed forgotten by

> "The pilgrim bands, who crossed the sea to keep
> Their Sabbaths in the eye of God alone
> In His wide temple of the wilderness."

They had fled from persecution, but they carried its spirit with them. Well does our late brilliant historian, Macaulay, describe the sect in the mother country, which they represented only too faithfully, "as turning the weekly Festival, by which the Church had from the primitive times commemorated the Resurrection of her Lord, into a Jewish Sabbath." And he adds this strong but not untrue account of their general system:—"Morals and manners were subjected to a code resembling that of the synagogue, when the synagogue was in its worst state. Their dress, their deportment, their language, their amusements, were regulated on principles resembling those of the Pharisees, who, proud of their washed hands and broad phylacteries, taunted the Redeemer as a Sabbath-breaker and a wine-bibber."

I noticed just now that the Puritans generally had modified the words of the Fourth Commandment in one respect. They had substituted the First Day for the Seventh Day. But there were those to whom this alteration seemed unjustifiable. If the Fourth Commandment was

binding in the letter, it was binding to the very letter. Men had no more right to change the day than they had to change the manner in which the day was to be observed. In consistency a Sabbatarian must keep his Sabbath on Saturday. One Traske, who founded a sect called Traskites, or Saturday Sabbatarians, and was judicially censured by Bishop Andrewes, set forth this doctrine. But Theophilus Brabourne, a minister of Suffolk, is usually regarded as their representative, from one of his books having been chosen by Bishop Francis White as worthy of a refutation. He seems to have been subjected to measures which induced him formally to retract his statements. His sincerity may be doubted; for we find him afterwards writing in the same strain; but the retractation is a fact. His doctrine still found upholders; and an Anabaptist, named Bampfield, revived it in A.D. 1672.

But before the appearance of the extreme phase of Sabbatarianism apparent in Brabourne's book, the disputes concerning the Lord's Day had excited notice in high quarters. Prideaux, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, pronounced a decision, as Professor of Divinity at Oxford, on the whole question, in A.D. 1622. He held strongly what I called in my Second Lecture the Apostolical view. In A.D. 1633 Laud became Primate of all England. Charles I. was induced to republish the unhappy Book of Sports, and two eminent men, Dr. Heylin and

Bishop Francis White, were requested by Laud to take up the subject of the Lord's Day. The former threw what he had to say into the form of an elaborate treatise, borrowing much of the learning which it displays from Bishop Prideaux, but not observing that writer's distinction between what is Apostolic and what is Ecclesiastical. Bishop F. White exhibits the same confusion in his rather acrimonious writings directed against Brabourne. Bishop Cosin in A.D. 1635 took the sounder view of Bishop Prideaux. So did, in some respects, Dr. Young in A.D. 1639; and so did Richard Baxter, who wrote expressly to moderate between the extreme Ecclesiastical view of Dr. Heylin, and the Judaic view of the Puritans. He felt, and he believed that he could prove, that there exists a *via media*, so to speak, between a theory which would not touch the conscience, and a theory which subjected it to Judaism. Perhaps, he somewhat approaches his Sabbatarian opponents in his precepts for the observance of the day; but he strongly protests against its assuming a penitential rather than a joyous character.

But we have somewhat anticipated. A multitude of Sabbatarian writers claim at least a passing notice, before we arrive at the date of Baxter's treatise, A.D. 1671. The most eminent of these were, Henry Burton (Prynne's compeer), in A.D. 1636; John Ley, the author of "Sunday a Sabbath" (which he dedicated to Archbishop

Ussher), in A.D. 1641; Hamon L'Estrange, also in A.D. 1641, who wrote "God's Sabbath before and under and after the Law vindicated from Novel and Heterodox Assertions;" Cawdrey and Palmer in A.D. 1645 and 1652, and Dean Owen in A.D. 1670. A favorite question was, "At what exact hours does the Lord's Day commence and conclude?" This employed the ingenuity of W. Prynne himself. Within the same range of time appeared various works, mostly in the Ecclesiastical extreme,—those, for instance, of Thomas Broad, of Edward Brerewood, of C. Dow, of David Primerose, of Dr. Pocklington, and of Bishop Ironside. Archbishop Bramhall, of the general merits of whose theory I have spoken already, wrote more soundly in A.D. 1658. Bishop Jer. Taylor took the purely Ecclesiastical view. Bishop Nicholson and Bishop Stillingfleet proposed a rather composite theory, in which they urged "the moral equity of one day in the week." This they added to the consideration that "the Lord's Day was a reputed Apostolical tradition." Bishop Sanderson wrote very learnedly on the subject, and referred to Apostolical practice, and to "probable insinuations of the Lord's Day in Scripture;" but his tone concerning the immutable character of the Day, is not so firm as that of the School of Bishop Prideaux and Archbishop Bramhall. Dr. Isaac Barrow and Thorndike are purely Ecclesiastical in their view.

I cannot pause to narrate the events of the

period,—Laud's contention with Chief Justice Richardson, about wakes and Sunday amusements—Daniel Neale's unfair representation of the whole matter as "a petition on the part of the laity for the religious observation of the Lord's Day, while the Bishop and Clergy were pleading for the profanation of it"—the Westminster Assembly and its Documents—the Theological decisions of Peers and Commons on the subject, and the final predominance of the Puritan Sabbath, until the Restoration. One strange phase of opinion was the revival of the Schwinckfieldian or Anabaptist notion, which had appeared just after the Reformation, that no religious day whatever was, either by Divine right or by Ecclesiastical institution, to be observed under Christianity. Meanwhile, in Scotland the Sabbatarian doctrines had taken deep root, and were improved into an elaborate system. Four examples shall suffice. In the year 1644, the "Six Sessions" ordained public intimation to be made, that "no person, man nor woman, shall be found vaging, walking, and going upon the streets upon the Lord's Day after the afternoon's sermon, keeping idle, and entertaining impertinent conferences." In the next year, the same court ordered that "the magistrates, attended by the ministers by course, shall go up and down the streets upon the Lord's Day after the afternoon sermon, and cause take particular notice of such as shall be found forth of their houses

yaging abroad upon the streets, and cause cite them before the Session to be rebuked and censured." And on the 5th of April, A.D. 1658, this direction was issued: — "The magistrates to cause some English soldiers go along the streets; and those outparts above written, both before sermon and after sermon, and lay hold upon both young and old whom they find out of their houses or out of the Church."

My fourth instance shall be taken from the records of the Presbytery of Strath-bogie, June 6, A.D. 1658:—"The said day, Alexander Cairnie, in Tilliochie, was delaitit for brak of Sabbath, in bearing ane sheep upon his back from the pasture to his own house. The said Alexander compeirit and declarit that it was of necessitie for saving of the beast's lyfe in tyme of storme. Was rebukit for the same, and admonished not to do the lyke."

If the Pharisees had sat in the Kirk Sessions they would have been more merciful; they would, indeed, have condemned the people for "rubbing out the corn in their hands," but they would not have condemned their walking in the fields on the Sabbath Day. The Pharisees were silenced by our Lord's allusion to saving an animal fallen into the pit on the Sabbath Day. So would not have been the Scottish Presbyterians of that period.

With the Kirk of Scotland, however, and with the doctrines and practices in or connected with

her Communion, we are not directly concerned. (It is only to be noticed further, that whereas in the Ancient Church the Lord's Supper was associated with the Lord's Day, the Kirk has severed this association. A semi-annual celebration of it has sprung up instead.) But we are much concerned with the Church of Ireland, both as being perfectly organized like our own, and as formally united to our own. How was the Lord's Day esteemed there? Till A.D. 1615, her authorized documents said no more than do those of the Church of England. But in that year, the thirty-nine Articles of the English Church were revised and amplified, chiefly under the direction of Archbishop Ussher, then Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and made in all One Hundred and Four. The Fifty-sixth of the Series is to this effect:—"The first day of the week, which is the Lord's Day, is *wholly* to be dedicated unto the service of God: and therefore we are bound therein to rest from our common and daily business, and to bestow that leisure upon holy exercises both public and private." In this document there is certainly more approach to precise strictness than the Church of England prescribes. The word "wholly" seems to indicate a forgetfulness of what human nature is, and of its inability to employ the entire day in a manner directly religious. But no Sabbatarian foundation is assumed for Sunday. It is what Scripture calls

it; and so far as this latter point goes, it has no Judaic character.

But whatever be our determination concerning this point, the Irish Articles were soon repealed practically, if not formally. In A.D. 1635, Archbishop Bramhall, at that time Bishop of Derry, prevailed on the Irish Convocation "to receive and approve" the Book of English Articles. This was conceived to be either an abrogation of the Irish Articles, or an admission that the two documents were perfectly in harmony. Archbishop Ussher and certain other Bishops held the latter view, and candidates for Holy Orders were required by them to subscribe to both. The former view has prevailed since the Restoration. Subscription has been demanded only to the First Canon, which enforces the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. Thus the object which Bishop Jer. Taylor in his funeral sermon on Archbishop Bramhall attributes to that enactment has been obtained. "That they and we might be *populus unius labii*, of one heart and one lip, building up our hopes of heaven on a most holy faith; and taking away that Shibboleth which made this Church (the Irish) speak too undecently, or rather in some little degree to speak the speech of Ashdod, and not the language of Canaan."

The Savoy Conference, as we have said, refused to make any alteration in our authorized documents so far as Sunday was concerned. Since that

time the Church of England has not formally meddled with the subject. Meanwhile Sunday has gone through considerable vicissitudes. What it was in the licentious reign of Charles the Second may be surmised from the mournful picture given by Evelyn of the Sunday preceding the death of that king. Puritanism had indeed died out in reference to the Lord's Day; but I confess that the state of things which succeeded was worse than Puritanism. In the middle of the eighteenth century there was a reaction. Methodism rose up. This is not the place to discuss either the justifiableness of that movement, or the influence which it has had upon the Church of England. But I may venture to quote a passage from Earl Stanhope which illustrates very clearly its bearing upon the immediate subject. "It is (says he) certainly one of the ill effects of Methodism that it has tended to narrow the circle of innocent enjoyments." Then, after mentioning some instances, he adds,—"Of one clergyman, Mr. Grimshaw, who joined the Methodists, and is much extolled by them, it is related by his panegyrist, 'He endeavoured to suppress the generally prevailing custom in country places during the summer, of walking in the fields on a Lord's Day, between the services, or in the evening, in companies. He not only bore his testimony against it from the pulpit, but reconnoitered the fields in person to detect and reprove the delinquents.' How

different was the saying of good old Bishop Hacket, 'Serve God, and be cheerful'"!

Bishops Beveridge, Horsley, and Jebb, to whom may be added Dr. Burton, hold a prominent position among those who have treated of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day since the Revolution. It is difficult to reduce their schemes and assertions to any one denomination. Bishop Beveridge considers the Sabbath to have been a positive institution, but one known before Judaism existed. Bishop Horsley insists that as the command to observe it appears in the Decalogue among commands confessedly moral, it must be a part of natural religion; and the Christian Church has, he conceives, restored the Sabbath to its patriarchal simplicity by divesting it of what was purely Judaic. Bishop Jebb and Dr. Burton, the former rather rhetorically, the latter more soberly, say the same thing. But how do they connect the Lord's Day with the Sabbath? This perhaps may be best described in the words of Archbishop Whately,—"They first adduce from the Old Testament many injunctions respecting the Sabbath; all of them confessedly relating to the *seventh* day of the week,—to the *Israelites*, and to the *Mosaic* dispensation. And next they adduce proofs from the New Testament and from early Christian writers, that the primitive Christians were accustomed to assemble on the *first* day of the week, to worship, and to commemorate their

divine Master's resurrection. And then they seem to regard their task as completed. But that the primitive Christians regarded the Fourth Commandment as binding on them, and believed that the Sabbath was transferred by divine authority from the last day of the week to the first, and that in celebrating the Lord's Day they were keeping the Sabbath,—all this, which is *the only point in dispute*, they take for granted, without offering any proof at all." Thus much for their view regarded doctrinally. It is, as I said before, almost identical with that of Dr. Bownd. But in practice it was not so severe as his. In fact, it possessed this point of unreality, it explained away the Jewish institution, which it had introduced into Christianity, in order to make it bearable by Christians. It owed its existence amongst us to a desire on the part of earnest men to meet the prevailing license of the eighteenth century in respect to the Lord's Day, by a directly divine precept. And it owed its continuance, partly to the example of certain Dissenting bodies who seemed during that sluggish period to possess more life than the Church, and partly to the neighbourhood of the Scottish Kirk, with which the Church of England was brought into very close contact.

Many excellent and good men, Richard Cecil for instance and Charles Simeon, whose foundation for Sunday was much the same as that of Dr. Bownd, and whose personal practice was

very strict, took a merciful view of its observance by others. "Christ came not to abolish the Sabbath (says Cecil), but to explain and enforce it, as He did the rest of the Law." But he proceeds, "Its observance was nowhere positively enjoined by Him, because Christianity was to be practicable, and was to go to all nations: and it comes thither stripped of its precise and curious circumstances. 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day,' seems to be the soul of the Christian Sabbath." The words of Simeon also are so full of charity and withal of sound common sense that I cannot help quoting them. "In my own personal habit I am as strict as most: but in my judgment as before God, I think that many religious characters—Ministers as well as others—are in error. I think that many Judaize too much, and that *they would have joined the Pharisees in condemning our Lord* on many occasions. But I would have you remark this. *I do not think that they err in acting up to their own principles* (*there* they are right); but that they err *in making their own standard a standard for all others.* This is a prevailing evil among religious persons. They will in effect argue thus:—'*I* do not walk out on a Sabbath day, *therefore* an artisan may not walk out into the fields for an hour on that day.' They forget that the poor man is confined all the rest of the week, which they are not: and that they themselves will walk in their own garden when the poor

have no garden to walk in. Now in this I do not think that they act towards others, as they, in a change of circumstances, would think it right for others to act towards them: and if your brother will limit his refreshment to such a relaxation as is necessary for health, or materially conducive to it, I shall agree with him, and shall rank this amongst works of necessity or of charity. Again, I am not prepared to utter either anathemas or lamentations if Ministers of State *occasionally*, in a time of *great pressure of public business*, and *in a quiet way*, avail themselves of an hour or two for conference with each other on that day. I do not commend it; but I do not condemn it. They cannot command their own times. Public affairs may be full as pressing and may call for immediate conference, as much as an ox or an ass for deliverance from a pit into which it has fallen; and I think that love to one's country may justify a deviation from a ritual observance of the Sabbath, as much as love or pity for a beast. In fact, if the most scrupulous will examine the frame of their own minds, and the real spirituality of their own conversation for two or three hours on some part of the Sabbath, they will find but little right, whatever their disposition be, to cast a stone at a poor man with his family, or at a Minister of State with his compeers. Again, I say, *they* may be *right;* but the others who think and act differently are not *therefore wrong*. Those who ate,

and those who refused to eat, meat offered to idols, were *both right* if they acted to the Lord, as were those also who observed, and those who did not observe, certain days, which under the Jewish dispensation were actually prescribed. I will tell you what I consider the perfect rule: let all judge for themselves in relation to the ritual observance of such matters; the strong not despising the weak, and the weak forbearing to sit in judgment on the strong. This will be the surest and best discharge of the duty of all parties whether to *God* or *man:* to God, who has said, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice;' and to man, who should be left to stand or fall to his own Master." So writes Charles Simeon.

But the very mercifulness of this teaching led to two very remarkable results. Men quite in earnest on the subject perceived that it was not in accordance with the theory on which it was founded. "If Sunday is the Sabbath, it ought to be observed exactly as the Jews may be supposed to have observed it," was their feeling. Hence their inculcation of what seemed the closest approach to such an observance, the strictness of a Scottish Sunday, which Dr. Chalmers deprecated, and, as far as he could, endeavored to modify. Though it is strange to find even him, when speaking of the person who, according to his view, observes Sunday rightly and literally, write thus:—"He could, but for example's sake, walk fearlessly abroad, and recognise in the

beauties of nature the Hand that has graced and adorned it." A few words, written by an intelligent resident in Scotland, will convey some idea of that strictness. "Here, (he says,) it is wrong to touch the piano, even for the most sacred music, on Sunday; it is wrong to take a walk, even between the services. One distinguished member of the Free Kirk openly avows his wish to see the interference of the police to prevent such a desecration of the day. At a recent meeting of the Presbyters and Lay Elders of the largest non-conforming body in Scotland—the United Presbyterians—some one expressed his horror that 'on the evening of the Lord's Day he found a Protestant minister walking with his wife on the ramparts of Strasbourg. That stroll was a miserable adoption of the Continental Sunday.' In many places a person can only preserve his credit as an observer of the Lord's Day, and obtain the indulgence of a walk, by frequenting a Church as distant from his own dwelling as his walking powers will allow; and, (he adds,) the extreme severity which is enforced out of doors produces very often a system of covert laxity." Such a Sunday as this, many who held the Sabbatarian theory felt themselves bound to introduce into England.

This was one result. Here is another. Finding that Sabbatarianism was producing here as much evasion as it produces in Scotland, if only nominally observed—as much unsocial austerity,

if really observed—and as much aversion to everything religious on the part of many who judged Christianity by this specimen of it, Archbishop Whately was led to re-examine the foundation of the system. His inquiries led him further, to an attempt to re-establish what has been termed the purely Ecclesiastical theory, which, as I understand it, introduces us to difficulties of another description. Certainly, it has met with no great favor, and I do not think that the development of it by the "National Sunday League to obtain the opening of the British Museum and other National Institutions on Sunday afternoon, and the repeal of the law which compels the closing of the Crystal Palace, and of other collections for instruction and rational recreation on that day," has at all added to its popularity. Men are afraid of a theory which they see touches the conscience only by Church ruling, and not by Scriptural and Apostolical authority. If the Sabbatarian view seems to be more severe than the authorized documents of the Church demand, and to reimpose fetters which Christ by His coming struck off, and which His Apostles did not gather from the ground and bind upon us; this other view seems to allow something more than liberty, or at least to open the door to something more than liberty.

At present the two opposing schools stand in direct antagonism. Is there no method by which they may be reconciled? The Church of England

has not encouraged either view very decidedly. But with her accustomed judgment she has, both by what she has said, and by what she has forborne to say,—intimated that while the Lord's Day is of Divine obligation, it is an institution established for the good of the whole man. The whole man I say—that marvellously composite being, of heavenly destiny, but of earthly conformation,—of high aims, but of weak and corruptible body, making him often fall short of them—and who, until he is *clothed upon* with a body incorruptible, requires refreshment for body as well as soul, even on the Lord's Day; yea, who may demand it on His Day, whose Great Human Heart could be touched with a feeling for the infirmities of His brethren.

LECTURE VIII.

PSALM CXVIII. 24.

THIS IS THE DAY WHICH THE LORD HATH MADE; WE WILL REJOICE AND BE GLAD IN IT.

Αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος· ἀγαλλιασώμεθα καὶ εὐφρανθῶμεν ἐν αὐτῇ.

THE tendency of what has been said hitherto is this:—To show, that as the Lord's Day is of Divine institution, because of Apostolic practice and of Scriptural indication, it is not necessary to resort to a Judaic origin of it in order to make it binding upon the conscience. I have contended that the Ancient Church considered it to be a day of obligation, quite independently of any connexion with the Sabbath, on purely Christian grounds;—that it was not until after the fifth century that this view was materially impaired; and that it was not until towards the end of the sixteenth century that a Sabbatarian origin was formally proposed instead.

I have contended also, that in the Ancient Church nothing like a Sabbatarian view of the

manner in which the Lord's Day should be observed, was even thought of;—that if its origin was not traced by the early Christians to enactments contained in the Jewish law, still less were they in the habit of referring, I will not say to the glosses put upon it by the Pharisees and Rabbins, but to that law itself, for restrictions and directions concerning it;—that as they did not dream of saying, the Sabbath still exists though shifted from the seventh to the first day of the week by Christianity, so they did not dream of asserting that the Lord's Day, admitting it to be a distinct institution, is to be observed as was the Sabbath either of tradition or of Scripture. And I may add here, that if any passages seem to imply anything opposed to these positions, they will be found on examination either to be of questionable genuineness, or to assert no more than is conveyed in such words as the following:—"The Jewish Church had one day, the Seventh, for her worship, which was marked in a special manner. The Christian Church has given up that day; but she has a day—a more glorious day—the First, for *her* worship, and that not a Jewish worship." In this manner may be explained also even Archbishop Bramhall's word "substitution," which is opposed to his general theory of the distinct origin and observance of the two days.

I have contended, moreover, that the Jewish system was at the best a system of restrictions

(though not so severe as is generally supposed); Christianity a dispensation of freedom.

And, in illustration of this, that in no respect is the difference between the two dispensations more manifest than in the religious character of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day respectively.

That, as to the former, it was primarily a rest (Ewald has termed it "a sacrifice of renunciation"), formally enjoined, and enforced under severe threatenings, and even penalties, in order to give time, and opportunity, and disengagement, for religious duties. (I am not speaking here of its other aspects.)

That, as to the latter, it was the setting apart a day as a religious day simply—nothing being *said* about rest—nothing being peremptorily laid down as to cessation from personal labour, or as to the enforcement of rest upon others.

These and many other positions bearing more or less upon them I have ventured to treat of, not merely as theological, but as literary and antiquarian topics, with what has been well called "the chartered freedom of historical discussion." And I have brought down my inquiry almost to the present time. My task, however, is not completed. I cannot conceal from myself, and I would not conceal from you, that there are several practical questions connected with our subject which it would not be right to pass over—questions blending themselves most nearly with our social life, our indi-

vidual comfort, and I may say with our earliest religious prepossessions. Such are the following: — Though the Lord's Day be not *the* Sabbath, is it not a day of rest? If of rest, of what sort of rest? Is it a rest permissive of recreation? If so, of what kind or degree? Supposing the rest to be not expressly commanded in Scripture, on what principle may society either enforce it by forbidding employments, or regulate it by directing recreations?

We will take these questions in order.

Is the Lord's Day a day of rest? Thank God, we may reply, It is. But why is it so? Because, for many hundred years, it has been so esteemed, and been productive of incalculable benefit? or because it has survived in that character the world's attempts to deprave it, or the attempts of corrupt churches to confuse it with other days? or because Constantine so decreed it, and found an echo and confirmation of his decree in the gladdened hearts of Christians? or because, when he so decreed it, their acquiescence proved that it had been either observed or desired as a rest before? or because, directly the Church was so far free as to be able to profess her rest, she proceeded to regulate it? or because certain early Fathers, as Tertullian, allude to cessation of business upon it? or because the inspired Apostles, who set it apart, must have had before them the analogy of the Jewish law? or because our own Church parabolically sets that law

before us in the public recital of the Decalogue? or because that law so set before us is founded deep in the necessities of human nature, which requires rest after labour? or because the mysterious example of the Creator seems to denote that rest and labour are to alternate? or because none who have tried to make it a rest have denied its blessedness? These are reasons, many of them powerful singly, and, in their combination, very powerful indeed, why the Lord's Day should be considered a day of rest, and though not *the* Sabbath, yet metaphorically a Christian Sabbath.

But, all these supposed and allowed to have their due weight, there is yet a higher reason. It is a divinely sanctioned religious day, or rather *the* religious day of Christians. It has the *nomen et omen* of the Lord's Day. As such, it is a day which from its very character draws us away from the ordinary things of this life—life's labours and life's cares—and bids us with hearts "swept and garnished" invite the Lord's presence. It is a day set apart—a day for religion. But how can it be this except those opportunities of distraction, which interfere with religion in general, are foregone? How can we—I speak for the multitude—how can we, amid the struggle how to live, the anxieties of families, the urgency of affairs, the competition of selfishness, imitate those of old in reverence for the Lord's Day, unless we make it a resting day?—unless for

those prayers that we utter we have time to search our hearts?—unless we have leisure to prepare for and meditate on the Holy Eucharist? —unless to that social worship in which we join is added sufficient disengagement to enable us to escape from the narrow circle of self into thoughts of and actions for the large family of God? From its very nature the day bids us lift up our hearts, and points us to the invisible. It must, therefore, be a rest from the routine of things temporal.

But the Lord of the Day is not merely God, but both God and Man. It is, therefore, the day of One who, flesh of our flesh, knoweth whereof we are made, and considereth that we are but dust. Accordingly, it is not merely one in which, as a religious day, we are reminded of the better things appertaining to the Divine part of our nature, and on which we have rest for them, but on which we may refresh and recreate our whole nature. Christ's resurrection from the dead, "with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature," being commemorated upon it, it is a day of rest to those for whom their Lord by His rising conquered sin and death.

Well, but if the Lord's Day is a day of rest, what sort of rest is it? Is it a mere animal rest? This was not enjoined, as I showed in the Fourth Lecture, even upon the Sabbath—much less, then, should a repose suitable only "to the beasts that

perish" be assigned to "the children of the resurrection." Is it a gloomy penitential rest, one which checks cheerful converse, family meetings, gladdening sights and sounds, invigorating air and exercise, contemplation of God's wonders in earth and sky, and which strictly forbids everything save direct participation in religious offices, and receiving or communicating religious instruction? Were it so, the Ancient Church would scarcely, I think, almost with one voice, have applied to the Lord's Day the words of our text, "This is the Day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it:" and the terms, cheerfulness, joyfulness, (εὐφροσύνη, χαρμοσύνη,) and the like, would not have occurred so often as they do occur in Patristical writers, as descriptive of a temper not unbefitting the Day of the Lord's Resurrection. The Sabbath itself, Christ being the interpreter of it, was no day of penance and mortification such as this would be. The religion indeed of the Lord's Day makes it a resting day, and may naturally tinge the enjoyments of it with sobriety; but sobriety is not sadness, still less is it abstinence and mortification.

Is it a rest merely for the intellectual man, the man of business, or the man of laborious bodily exertion, that according to the poet's words, "vegeti præscripta ad munia surgant," on the Monday? Is it intended merely to turn their thoughts into another channel, say of pleasant recreation, or sight-seeing, or travelling, or con-

vivial gatherings? It might be so, could the thought be laid aside that each of these is an immortal man. But can this be done on the Day of Him who rose from the dead, whose Resurrection is a pledge of ours, who won our Resurrection for us?

Is it again a rest so strict that upon it all labour is forbidden, and to all, whatever occasion of necessity or charity; or public or private good, may call us to action? Then surely He was wrong who healed the sick even on the Sabbath, and desired the sick man to carry his bed; who sat at meat on the Sabbath Day in the house of one of the Pharisees, where servants waited upon Him; who justified circumcision on the Sabbath, and blamed not the priests' offices, many of them minute and servile, performed in the temple on that day?

Thus far negatively, upon this part of our subject. Perhaps an outline of positive teaching upon it may be obtained from the following words of Bishop Prideaux, which I give you in a quaint but in the main correct translation, made some two hundred years ago: — "He that endeavors to pursue the several bye-ways, and dissonant clamours of particular men, in this present argument, entereth into a most inextricable Labyrinth. But generally those things which others have propounded in some obscurity, may be reduced most fitly unto these two heads: First, that we mark distinctly, in

the celebration of this Day, what special duties are commanded, and next, what offices are permitted. To the discovery whereof, these words, *our God, our neighbour*, and *ourselves*, like a Mercurial finger, will direct our journey, amidst the several turnings of this present world. These three are principally aimed at in those pious duties, which on this day have been commended to us, or rather imposed on us, by the acts and practice of the Apostles. First, 'the Disciples came together, to break Bread and hear the Word:' which, without solemn and preparatory Prayers, were a faint Devotion (Acts xx.). This is the honor due to God. 'Collections' are secondly appointed (1 Cor. xvi.). This is in reference to our neighbour. And last of all, St. John 'was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day' (Rev. i.). This in relation to ourselves: that so our pious contemplations, borne by the wings of the Spirit, may ascend on high; 'even to those Hills from whence cometh our Salvation.' Therefore, upon this Day, God's people are to meet in the Congregation, to celebrate Divine Service, and to hear the Word: Alms to be given, and godly Meditations to be cherished with our best endeavors. From whence ariseth that, as an *Accessory* in the Gospel, which was a *Principal* in the Law of Moses, Rest from servile Works, and from the ordinary works of our vocation. (Unde consectarium fit illud in Evangelio, quod in Legis eminet frontispicio, ab operibus, sive servilibus, sive

vocationis, vacatio.) For since there is not extant either commandment or example in the Gospel, which can affix the Rest of the Jewish Sabbath to the Lord's Day now celebrated; and that our Christian liberty will not away with that severe or Ceremonial kind of Rest which was then in use: we only are so far to abstain from work, as it is an impediment of such duties as are then commanded. . . . . To end in brief, those things are all commanded, which do advance God's public service; and those permitted, which are no hindrance thereto. Of this sort, specially, are the works of necessity . . . . ; then, works of Charity, first, in relation to ourselves; and here we are permitted recreations (of what sort soever) which serve lawfully to refresh our spirits, and nourish mutual neighbourhood amongst us: next in relation to others, and here no labour (how troublesome soever) is to be refused, which may accommodate our neighbour, and cannot fitly be deferred. Where we must always keep this rule; that this our Christian liberty be void of scandal, I mean of scandal justly given, and not vainly caught at; that we pretend not charity to absent ourselves from religious duties, when covetousness or loathing, or neglect of God's holy Ordinances are underhand the principal motives . . . And unto all these, whether Recreations or Entertainments, Feastings and other indifferent customs, it only appertaineth to the Religious Magistrate to prescribe bounds and limits; not

to the rash zeal of every one, which out of Schismatical Stoicism . . . relapse into Judaism, nor on the other side, to every prodigal and debauched companion."

The words of Bishop Prideaux, may, I think, with a few qualifications and explanations, supply something like a principle or set of prinples for the employment and enjoyment of the Lord's Day. And if any choose to insist that because no command is given in set words for rest, all labour is allowable—or, that if any labour is allowable, none can be fairly prohibited—or again, that supposing rest to be politically and socially desirable and expedient, no limitation of the nature of the recreation to be enjoyed upon it is reasonable—replies are at once ready.

For the first and second points. An intelligent Christian State cannot possibly ignore the fact of the religion of the Lord's Day, and is therefore bound to promote it. As little can it help perceiving that except opportunity is given for the exercise of that religion, the world will intrude into the Day, and swamp it altogether. There are millions of persons subject to the State who as much require protection by reason of their poverty, or their irresolution, or their blindness to what is good for them, from the spirit of the world, as they require protection from aggression upon their goods or attacks upon their person. And as Christian men, one of the dearest

rights which they claim, is the Lord's Day. To these, therefore, it extends its aid, by forbidding, as far as may be, the external exercise of men's callings on the Lord's Day. I say, *the external exercise*, for it can only do *this*, and it transcends its legitimate province if it attempts more. And I say, *as far as may be*, for first, it often finds itself dealing with miserable neighbourhoods, which cannot be dealt with by sharp remedies applied indiscriminately, but must be prepared by religious and social influences. Then, it has to deal with an accumulation sometimes of millions, crowded together after an abnormal sort, covering I know not how many contiguous square miles, whose mere bodily wants, and measures for whose temporal convenience and even existence, must cause the employment of a vast number of persons on every day. And thirdly, the limits between what is a public and what is a private exercise of a man's calling, are frequently so faint and indistinct, that it cannot touch the one without invading the other—or cannot touch one class of persons without unfairly indulging another class.

By the light of these replies we may, I think, see our way to the solution of some of the questions which beset us in reference to Sunday. The State, if it has a conscience, and a conscience as well-informed as that of individuals, ought indeed to deplore, and, we may be sure, does deplore, the awful condition of many parts

of great cities,—the buying and selling that goes on—the disappearance from the face of things not merely of anything like religion, but of anything like rest on the Lord's Day—and the discouragement which the better disposed part of the population experiences from the competition of worldly neighbours. And therefore it is bound, so far as may be possible, to put a stop to this state of things. But what is it to do? Is it to determine at once to close every shop —to prevent all dealings of man with man on Sunday? Surely, until the dwellings of the poor are better fitted for keeping perishable articles —until wages are so paid as to enable persons to make their purchases on the evening of Saturday, and until each poor man has convenience at home for preparing his scanty Sunday meal, it were worse than mockery, it were cruelty itself, to insist that none shall supply his brother's need in these and many other matters relating to his very existence. What remedy, then, would you propose? Shall it be to legalise Sunday dealings during certain hours or up to a certain hour, and out of certain hours or after a certain hour to render them illegal? The remedy were worse than the disease. You would thereby infringe upon the principle that Sunday is a day of religion, and so of rest. You would admit formally that a considerable portion may be subtracted from it. On this ground I firmly protest against a certain Bill

which has just passed the House of Lords—but which I hope will never become law. For its effect may be stated thus—(observe, I do not mean the intention of the respected proposer of it, but its effect or tendency)—"Whereas, at present, with certain exceptions, the Divine authority of the Lord's Day is recognised as a reason for general suspension of business during its continuance; and whereas, also, such exceptions premised, whatever business now takes place on that day, is a contravention, whether excusable or not, of provisions for such suspension; this state of things shall determine. For the future, the public recognition of the Lord's Day rest shall be considerably limited in the case of large classes of tradesmen in London, whose numbers may, by a little management, be almost indefinitely extended. And, by implication, the customers of these large classes of tradesmen shall be tempted to limit it in like manner." In other words, that whereas suspension of business on the Holy Day is now the rule, and carrying it on, whether partially or wholly, the exception, it shall hereafter be lawful, in London, to large classes, to traffic, as a rule, in many cases up to Ten o'clock, in many others throughout the Day, with the reservation of from Ten to One. To such narrow limits, in the chief City of this Christian land, in the nineteenth century of Christianity, is Christ's honor to be reduced! If the Bill passes, the Lord's Day is

no more. Οὕτως ἠφάνισται ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὥσπερ εἴ τις τὸ ἔαρ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐξέλοι. And though we may say, its operation is confined to the Metropolis, and that even there, "Three Hours" will still be reverenced, these questions may be pertinently asked, When was a principle ever surrendered without ill consequences? How long will it be before this precedent affects the provinces? How long will the "Three Hours" be spared to us? I do not speak at random, but after a careful perusal of the Bill. And I assert, advisedly, two things concerning it. First, it will make matters worse than they are. At present, but few shops are open during the afternoon, and a vast proportion of those which are open in the morning, is so in spite of the law. The Bill will legalise the morning opening, and, in many cases, enable the owners (and by enabling tempt them) to re-open them from One o'clock throughout the day. And secondly, the Bill says virtually, whereas the Legislature was the guardian of the Lord's Day, and held it in trust for the religion and the rest of the People; it is expedient to confiscate this trust property, and to convert it to secular uses, allowing out of it "three hours" to those whose right it *was*, but *is no longer*. I hope, I say, this Bill will never become law. A better expedient would seem to be this: To retain the principle of prohibition intact, to retain even penalties for violation of it, to strengthen, if necessary, the means

of enforcing penalties; but remembering that the religion which it is intended to promote is one, which, like its Author, "will have mercy and not sacrifice," to abstain from enforcing penalties where the offenders are scarcely responsible. Meanwhile, however, to encourage all such missionary and philanthropic agencies as may prepare and make ready the way for further measures bye and bye.

Of course this forbearance would not apply, save in a very few exceptional instances, to trade in anything but the necessaries of life. Even in respect to these, there seems to be no absolute impossibility in the enforcement of the closing principle at certain hours on Sunday. As to labours carried on within the dwellings, whether of rich or poor, other influences must be brought to bear, of which we shall speak presently.

So again with respect to travelling. Here it is perfectly obvious that the State should, for the sake both of those who minister to travelling, and of those who might be tempted to travel, enforce, as far as possible, the religion and the rest of Sunday. But such are the necessities of its subjects that it can only do a very little, only diminish the number of trains, only regulate the hours, only insist that the attendants shall be sufficiently numerous to allow of their having some repose, if not a total repose. The same remark will apply to postal and police arrangements, and to those many social matters

which an intricate system does and must bring before it. The State may do something, and it does do something, to reduce the amount of things which are performed on the Lord's Day, and which, so far forth, assimilate it to other days. It may do something to ameliorate the condition of those whom itself employs, by having in each department sufficient relays of servants, and by treating them, not as mere instruments, but as men with immortal hopes, and present spiritual life. But it cannot stop such labours altogether. Those who demand most loudly that it should stop them, would do well to recollect the confusion and almost dismay caused no long time ago by a temporary concession to the demand for the absolute closing of the Post Office during the twenty-four hours of Sunday.

In all this, the State, which I have supposed to be thus acting, acts strictly upon principle. It forbids labour on Sunday, as for a man's own worldly profit, absolutely. It only permits what is accidentally for a man's own worldly profit, from broad considerations essentially connected with society. It compels no man to labour on that day, for it compels no man to enter upon such and such employments. But it is obliged to say, if a man enters upon such and such employments, some labour must necessarily be endured. Its forbearance, its tenderness, its consideration for its subjects, its remembrance

of their immortal destinies, its thoughtfulness for their temporal interests, remain unimpeachable and unimpaired, though let of their full development. It feels, that in a matter on which no positive directions are laid down in Holy Scripture, it has to determine, on a Scriptural view of its own functions, what is on the whole necessary, first, in the way of prohibitions, and secondly, in the way of merciful interpretation of its own prohibitions. Regarded merely as ancient records, the provisions of the Hebrew economy are monuments and lessons to a Christian State. But the Holy Volume in which those provisions are contained, exhibits to it at least an adumbration of the manner in which both the moral obligation to worship God at some time, and a positive law to worship Him at a particular time, may and ought to be carried out.

And so it is with reference to the recreations permissible on the Lord's Day. Here Scripture has given no exact directions as to what men may indulge in, or from what they are bound to abstain. But in Scripture are found assertions of the necessity of rest, and indications that the periodic rest enjoined under a stricter and less pliable dispensation than Christianity, was compatible with a variety of relaxations, and that on it the poor, the uninstructed, the weak in mind or in body, were considered by the strong, and protected by the State. So, a

Christian State acts thus: First, it interferes as little as possible with private amusements on Sunday, leaving them to the conscience of the individual; secondly, it gives a wise facility of air and exercise to the working classes and the poor, especially in crowded localities, by providing parks and similar open spaces; thirdly, it throws no obstacles in the way of those who, unable to find these indispensable requisites at home, desire to move elsewhere to find them. But here it pauses. It does not compel men to listen to, and virtually to approve of, any public declaration, like that in the "Book of Sports," that such and such things are lawful or desirable; or resort to ruder ages, such as those before the Reformation, for mummings and miracle plays —or to over strict countries, such as Scotland, for exclusively devotional pleasures—or to lax countries, such as may be found on the Continent, for a license which does away with the sanctity of the day altogether. It does not insist that all persons shall recreate themselves in the same way, or lay down that every mode of relaxation, abstractedly lawful, shall be permissible. It considers, on the one hand, that men of different labours and pursuits need differences of relaxation; and on the other, that the following points fairly come under the State's notice; "Do such and such amusements make large and noisy gatherings? Do they involve unduly extensive employment of attendants? Do they offer induce-

ments to the multitude to forget the religion of the Day? Do they offend the reasonable scruples of the religious and well-affected? Are they but pretexts of affording relaxation to the million, while they are really attempts to improve gigantic trading speculations?" So again, it does not pronounce it to be lawful or unlawful, in the abstract, to contemplate works of art, or collections of natural history, or the like, on the Lord's Day. But it refrains from having them then opened to the public. And this for various reasons. In some cases, because the plea of public health or necessity is not sufficiently established; in others, because if public collections are opened, it might be difficult to discover grounds on which similar private collections should be closed; and in others, because on the principle—

"Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes,"

a design of getting rid of the religious character of the day, under a specious show of devoting it to moral and intellectual improvement, may be apprehended. In general, the State seems to hold, that any systematic employment of the Christian rest, which shall intensely direct the mind of the multitude to special studies not religious—and that any large assemblies, not religious, or even pretending to be religious, then held, are an intrusion upon the character of the Day, in which if men meet together, it is as the

Body of Christ, in commemoration of His Resurrection, and in anticipation of their own.

No doubt, such is the complication of things, the State is unable to be entirely consistent. Did it pretend to be so, it might easily be confounded by the argument, that it is no more objectionable to visit the National Gallery, than to gaze at the Cartoons at Hampton Court, which, as far as one can see, do as little harm as the gardens there—that one may as well be studying practical Geology in Jermyn Street, or Archæology in the British Museum, as Botany in the gardens at Kew—that if it is not wrong for the proprietors of the Crystal Palace or the members of the Zoological or Botanical Societies, to walk in their pleasure grounds on the Lord's Day; it is not wrong for the general public to be admitted into those places. But to demand absolute consistency would be to put the matter on a wrong issue. The State has to promote the religious and temporal welfare of its subjects. It conceives itself bound to promote the former, as far as it can, and the latter by such means as will not impede the realization of the former. It cannot, without abdicating its functions, decline the office of determining how far it can reconcile these two designs. At the same time, as it cannot, without tyranny, meddle with the use which men make personally of their own property, it does not meddle with proprietors, be they many or be they few, who use their gardens or collections

purely for their private, ungainful purposes. On them rests the responsibility, and on them, if there be sin in using them, must rest the sin.

Still less would it be fair to make the State responsible for the indirect consequences of things which it is obliged to allow; for the license of those who will not enjoy liberty in a sober manner; for the noisiness in which Sunday visits to the country sometimes terminate; or for the adoption of the plea of necessity for such visits by those who, in conscience, have no right to urge that plea. It does what it can. Experience shows that it cannot do much more than it does. Whenever it attempts to descend to minute particulars; to distinguish between travellers with grave cause, and travellers for mere pleasure, or between houses which dispense one sort of refreshment, and those which dispense another; in fact, directly it gets to rules, it is met by a cry of class legislation, or by those uproarious demonstrations, of which, no long time ago, one of our Metropolitan Parks was the scene.

Indefensible as those demonstrations were in a legal point of view, they were to a certain extent natural—as being produced by a sense of unfairness. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that this was their sole moving cause. Considerable selfishness and thoughtlessness for the welfare of the general body were mingled with it. "The poor (says a well-known Nonconformist) have their dependents as well as the rich;

dependents, not on an individual but on a number. Was not the real import of the demonstration this? Was it not the working classes saying to the rich, 'Let us work our dependents, and you shall work yours; give ours rest, and you *shall* give your own rest?' Was it not working men making a compact with the rich to use money-power to force the dependents of both classes to serve *their* pleasures instead of enjoying a day of rest? No man is wholly servant, and none is wholly master. On Committees the lord serves; in shops, in omnibusses, and steamboats, the mechanic is employer. As servants, both classes claim liberty. Lord or blacksmith, they will have their Sunday. As employers, both claim power, power to deprive others of a rest as expressly given to servants as to masters. The cry of Hyde Park was a cry for power. It was the gold-beater, the joiner, the currier, the tailor, crying 'Power, power over all whom I employ! Power over bakers, stokers, drivers, barmaids, green-grocers, and butchers! Power to say to all who depend upon me, Work on Sunday or starve!'"

This extract has perhaps the faults of ignoring the necessities of a great town population too entirely, and of insisting that any relaxation which involves the employment of others on the Lord's Day is unlawful. But it contains the mournful truth, that the religious character of the day, and the Christian bonds which should

bind each man to his brother, and charitable allowance for each other's circumstances, are not unfrequently forgotten by those who insist most urgently on its character as a Day of Rest.

Some, however, may still assert, in opposition to what has been urged above, that "all legislation in respect to Sunday is Sabbatarian;" that "a Christian's surrender of his time to God ought to be purely one of love." The latter of these propositions I grant to the fullest extent. It ought to be so. It is so, in theory, and hence, I suppose, it is that minute directions for the employment of the Lord's Day are not found in Scripture. But then it must ever be remembered how large a portion of Christians, in fact, how nearly all of us, need to be considered under education, and in preparation for better things; how readily we are carried away by bad example, and how necessary therefore, it is, that the State, which concerns itself with the *external* maintenance of the moral commandments, should concern itself with the *external* maintenance of this positive commandment also. For observe, the State does not venture upon the training of the *inner* man, in the one case or in the other. That is left to other and higher and more permeating influences. It cannot directly check envy, or hatred, or concupiscence, or the covetous desire; but it can to a certain extent, and to that extent it ought to, prevent or punish the aggressions which lead to some of these, and the crimes

which proceed from others of these. So, it cannot make men love Sunday, or keep it on a right principle. But it may, and it ought to, remove inducements to forgetfulness of its divine character; it may forbid actions which reduce it to a mere secular institution, and aggressions upon it which tend to its practical abolition. To prevent its operation in this way would be to ignore the value of secondary motives and checks, and their utility as educational appliances. I might say something, perhaps, of the effect of a foreign Sunday, even upon a well-disposed English traveller, when he is freed from such secondary motives and checks as he finds at home. But I forbear. I will only observe further on this head, that I totally dissent from the proposition that "all legislation in respect to Sunday is Sabbatarian." Very little of such legislation as we have at present for Sunday or the Lord's Day can be called Sabbatarian. (There is scarcely an English Act of Parliament, if indeed there is one, in which the word *Sabbath* occurs, though the Divine authority of the Lord's Day is in set terms acknowledged. In the Queen's proclamation it is called the Lord's Day.) Our legislation is, so to speak, far less Sabbatarian than was the edict of Constantine, which has sometimes been thus designated. For it does not, as that edict appeared to do, provide for a different sort of obedience to it by different classes.

Others, as Mr. J. S. Mill, assert that "all legislation in respect to Sunday is an illegitimate interference with the rightful liberty of the individual." I am not much concerned to answer this objection at length, for I find it supported by the following statements:—"It remains to be proved that society, or any of its officers, holds a commission from on high to avenge any supposed affront to Omnipotence, which is not also a wrong to our fellow-creatures;" and again, "The notion that it is one man's duty that another should be religious was the foundation of all the religious persecutions ever perpetrated, and, if admitted, would fully justify them." Now, passing over the fallacy contained in the word "wrong," such statements obviously ignore,—first, the Christianity of Government; secondly, the duty of Government to promote, so far as it can, the welfare of its subjects in accordance with Christian principles. And they confound two very distinct things, the making men think alike, and the providing against external hindrances to their thinking and acting rightly. I find too, on examining the work from which these extracts are made, that the maxim,—"Deorum injuriæ Dîs curæ" is quoted with approbation by its author. If this maxim is to be admitted to its full extent, the ruler indeed "bears the sword in vain." Immorality, as well as neglect of God's worship, both of them, though in a different way, come under the head of

"despite done to the Divine Majesty." It would be difficult to lay down a principle on which the legislator may interfere with external acts tending to the former, while he is forbidden to interfere with external acts tending to the latter.

But how shall the Lord's Day be placed upon its true foundation? In other words, how shall it be employed both for the glory of God and for the good of man?

Two agencies may be set in motion—that of the Church, and that of individuals.

A prominent method by which the Church might place the Lord's Day on its true foundation would, I think, be this; so to meet the wants of the people as to enable them to make it a Religious Day, without losing it as a Rest Day. At present her services are so long, or I should rather say, so continuous, and celebrated at such an hour, as to be unavailable to the poor, and wearisome to children and invalids. What pastor has not lamented the almost total neglect of the Holy Communion by the poor, and found his exhortations to them to come to Morning Service, when alone it is generally administered, well nigh in vain? And yet who does not see, that it is next to impossible to the harassed mother to do more than prepare her children for Church or for School, while she has to attend to household cares and the Sunday meal of the family? Who can expect the poor man, unaccustomed to mental exertion, and worn out with

bodily exertion, to frequent a Morning Service of three or even of two hours duration? And how few domestic servants can be spared for so long a time, even if they possessed sufficient powers of attention! One urges them perhaps to attend. A feeling arises in them that more is expected than can be performed. And, even if an Afternoon Service is attended, a severance takes place of the Lord's Day duties from the Lord's Supper, an ordinance which is not merely a distinguishing mark of the Day, but is the means, to those who in faith partake of it, of maintaining the Risen Life.

I suggest then, (earnest missionary action being presupposed,) that an important step on the part of the Church, if she would enable persons in general to keep Sunday as a religious Day, would be to rearrange her Services. This might, in many cases, be done at once, by separating offices now blended together, and by administering the Holy Communion in the afternoon or evening, sometimes as a separate Service, sometimes as an appendage to other Services. What insuperable objection there can be to this, I cannot conceive. The poor man's scanty repast at mid-day, is seldom such as to unfit him for partaking in that holy ordinance; and, whether we look to the time of its institution, or to the practice of antiquity, we find no special limitation of it to the hour of the day at which it is now generally celebrated. [There are parishes, though these are rather

exceptional, where a very early Communion might be desirable, and where indeed it has been introduced with good effect. This, however, would scarcely meet the need which I have now in view. I would fain enable those to enjoy the ordinance, who are poor, who are overworked during the week, or who are urgently required at home from domestic or other causes. They cannot attend even the one o'clock Communion; still less could they anticipate that hour. Yet many of them can and do attend the Communion at a later hour, as is proved by most satisfactory testimony. I would increase such opportunities as much as possible.] And then, though I would not at this moment urge that our Prayer-Book should be revised, and certainly not by a Royal Commission, I would venture to plead that we do need additions to it, in the shape of shorter and simpler Services for the poor, for the unlettered and for children. "A parish can never be all at Church at once, (says Thorndike). The order of the Church never becomes the Church till it demonstrates a care of all Christian souls alike. Between the hours of eight and twelve there is time enough for two assemblies. For who could wish either of them to exceed an hour? They that would have the reformation of the Church to be indeed that which the law of the land calleth it, should first provide a course to be established for law, by which all Christian souls (who have an equal interest in the common salvation)

might serve God in public all Sundays and Festivals." He has more to the same purpose: and his principle may be extended. If the people cannot be brought to Church, and especially to the Holy Communion, at our present hours, and with our existing Services, the hours and the Services must be adapted to suit them. I am persuaded that we shall never make Sunday a religious Day to the mass of our population, until we make its Services such as the mass can attend, more compatibly with their circumstances and habits, and feel interest in, as brought more to the level of their mental cultivation.

It is not a fault of the Church itself that I have next to notice, but one properly belonging to ourselves of the Clergy. We have, perhaps, taken a narrow view of the manner in which Sunday, as a day of rest, may or must be spent. Accustomed to be occupied throughout it in religious services, and with the deep interests of souls which they involve—sustained by a sort of excitement which prevents its palling upon us—and, moreover, in many instances, finding in it the crown and object of the past week's work, and strength for the week to come—we imagine that the Laity ought to or can feel exactly as we do, ought to be able to keep up the same interest, ought to find their rest in purely devotional exercises. If the truth must be spoken, the Clergy are not the best possible judges of what the Laity can endure. The Clergy

are not resting, but labouring. The Laity are and ought to be comparatively resting. They can, therefore, scarcely be expected to maintain during the whole of the Lord's Day that continuity of religious thought which may become the Clergyman. Their pursuits are so various, that their rest requires variety also. The same rest does not refresh the student and the artisan, the man "in cities pent," and the labourer in the country. In a word, the different occupations and abodes of persons should be considered in determining how they may be rested. Besides, therefore, making our services interesting, accessible, and such as men may easily frequent, the Clergy should, so it seems to me, not frown on those who consider Sunday to be, within certain limits, a day of cheerful relaxation, of family union, of social enjoyment, as well as of religious services. There is nothing in Scripture to forbid this, even though Sunday be, (which it is not), identical with the Sabbath. Nay, Christ in Scripture allowed and sanctioned this on the Sabbath; and human nature, even under the happiest circumstances, most imperatively requires this on the Sunday. But, if this point be allowed, and if, especially in great cities, men cannot obtain change without means of locomotion, we should not, (I appeal to my brethren of the Clergy in this matter), brand those as Sabbath-breakers, who avail themselves of the means which offer of changing air and scene,

at any rate, if they do it consistently with the higher claims of the day. We should not pronounce that those who are enjoying themselves harmlessly, are, even though not occupied religiously, irreligious. If we do so, we either succeed in making people believe that all Sunday recreation is wrong, or we do not. If we do, we tempt them to break an obligation felt, but felt to be too severe, and so we implant in them the habit of transgressing obligations. If we do not, if they see through the fallacy of our statements, they distrust statements coming from us in other matters, and in reference to these particular statements, rush headlong into the opposite extreme. Rejecting a Puritanical or Judaic Sunday, they betake themselves to a Continental one. "The Church," they say (for they confound the Church and the Clergy) "cares for nothing but our souls. She is very well intentioned, perhaps, but she does not know the world, she does not know human nature. She should remember that even by the analogy of Judaism, the Sunday was made for man, and not man for the Sunday. We will neglect her and take care of our bodies. We feel the present want, let the more distant be provided for as it may."

I shall not, I think, be supposed to desire anything like foreign license. All I urge is, that the moderation which the Church of England has displayed in not enjoining upon her members austerity and mournfulness on the Lord's Day,

and by consequence in leaving to them the cheerfulness allowed by Antiquity, should be carried out by her Clergy. In fact, that their judicious inculcation of religious offices, and of temporal relaxation upon it, should be so managed, as not to take the expression either of a Scottish enforcement of the Sabbath on the one hand, or of a Continental secularization of Sunday on the other. The former seems to be in danger of forgetting the weakness of our human nature, the latter of ignoring and so of choking the aspirations of our divine nature. Other remedial measures might be suggested, the revival of the Church Festivals for instance, (there are not many in the course of the year,) or of a Saturday half-holiday and the like. But let not us of the Clergy, especially those of us who write in fresh air and in pleasant scenes, or find our pleasure in quiet literary pursuits, whose profession is religion, forbid the Laity, especially the poor among the Laity, their scanty rest, or place upon them a burden which we do not bear ourselves. As one who does not write in the country, but who has for years lived in the heart of London, I speak for them, both feelingly and from some experience.

All of us, Laity as well as Clergy, individuals as well as the Church, may do much by our thoughtfulness for our weaker brethren, for the young and the poor especially, and let it be added, (in the case of those in better circumstances) by our personal self-denial, towards

making Sunday that divine yet humane institution, that blessing to the whole man, which it was doubtless intended to be. I fear that we oftentimes make mistakes in this matter. To begin with children—we find it difficult to know what to do with them on Sunday — we take them to Church perhaps twice—we give them Services too long even for adults. They understand but little of the prayers, and less of the Sermon. But this gets over only a part of the day—what is to be done with the remainder? Perhaps we have taught them a question from what is called the broken catechism, "Can those be thought to keep the Sabbath Day holy who play on it?" to which the answer is "By no means"—and we feel bound to carry out this sort of teaching. Accordingly, when away from Church, they must not do this, they must not do that—they must sit still—or be very quiet—or read only good books, and the like. Can we wonder that they associate religion and Sunday with dulness and restraint, and that when they become their own masters they dislike a Christianity which seemed to check all natural cheerfulness and give them little that they could feel or understand?

And if this is the case with our own children, it is much more the case with the children of the poor. To the restraint of two Church Services is frequently added the restraint of a Sunday School. The Lord's Day is made to

them a day of positive work. Can we wonder, again, that so soon as they grow to an age to quit that School, they associate Sunday, and everything connected with it, with heaviness and wearisomeness? In Church they got little they could understand; they were frequently seated where they could neither hear nor see: out of Church they were met by lessons—well intended indeed, but ensuing upon what they had done or suffered already, too much for their jaded minds and bodies. An eminent Clergyman, Dr. Miller, has said publicly, that "we need have many searchings of heart when we see the small effect produced by our Sunday Schools, and by our Sunday teaching generally; and that though there are objections to detaching children from the services in the Church, even this is preferable to giving them what they cannot understand." He says, in effect, that "the whole treatment of Sunday in reference to the children of the poor requires revision." Whether any such continuous tension of mind, or stagnation of bodily energy for a whole day, and that on His Day, who cared for little children, should exist, I leave you to judge. Whether any Sunday School should be established which does not possess a recreation-ground in which the children should be allowed such regulated amusement at intervals throughout the day as shall suit their age and requirements; and whether, again, there should not be a graduation

of the spiritual nutriment of children as compared with men, analogous to that which is applied in bodily food, I leave to your charitable consideration. At present there is undoubtedly something wrong. Persons, directly they quit School, throw off Sunday altogether in disgust; and hence the frequent confession that their first step in evil was Sabbath-breaking. There is some truth in that confession. But to state their case more correctly — They had been taught to consider the Lord's Day a burden. They could not bear it—threw off that burden, and with it, all reverence for God, and all thought of the unseen and their own hereafter.

And, perhaps, we may be in some respects too severe judges of the conduct of the poor generally on this Day. We wonder that they do not love to go to Church twice, and stay at home the remainder of their time and read their Bibles. We wonder that our servants, possessed, so we express it, of many religious advantages, improve them so inadequately, relish them so imperfectly. Here, again, let our charity come in. Let us consider their distractions, their wrestlings for bare existence, their confined dwellings, their narrow education, the few opportunities of enjoyment which fall to their lot. Let our self-examination come in. How little with our superior knowledge, and freer disposal of our time, do we realize the religion of the Day! How irregularly do we attend

its services! How small a portion of it do we devote to the examination of Holy Scripture! How much do we allow our ordinary labours, (for intellectual studies are the labours of the educated), to intrude upon our thoughts of better things! Let our self-reproval and determination of will come in. How little have we done to raise the condition of our poorer neighbours! Shall we not do our part in evangelising them, even to our own discomfort? And above all, let our self-denial come in. Let us resolve that we who can rest at other times, will so lighten the labours of our dependents on the Lord's Day, as to enable them to promote the glory of God, and their own present and future welfare, remembering that solemn account which we must render at the tribunal of Christ.

There are, as I have candidly admitted, many difficulties connected with the practical solution of the questions which I proposed to treat of in this Lecture; and I cannot for a moment hope that I have done more than suggest principles towards their solution. I have not determined, for I am not authorised to determine, that a Clergyman should tell his Parishioners, that recreations, such as our law allows, out of Church hours, and by those who have attended Church, and within the bounds of their own Parish, are unlawful to them in the sight of God. He himself must judge, not merely whether, if

restricted, his people might do better, but whether they will not probably do much worse, by resorting to the ale-house, or the gin-shop. I have not attempted to solve the problem, should reading-rooms belonging to working men be opened on the evening of Sunday. This again, must be considered, not simply with reference to the literature which may be contained in them, but frequently, especially in large towns, regard being had to the condition and temptations of young, unmarried men, in that class of society. And rules like that given by Bishop Horsley, "that the same proportion of this Day, on the whole, should be devoted to religious exercises, public and private, as every man would spend of any other day in his ordinary business," I have not thought it right to attempt. It has been said, and said truly—

> "High Heaven rejects the lore
> Of nicely calculated less or more."

On this, and on many other grounds, it is the wisest method to leave the determination of particulars to the consciences of individuals, principles being supposed to be established. The conscience of a man will rarely lead him astray, if informed by such historical inquiries as I have endeavoured to lay before you, and enlightened by earnest prayer, and love to God and man. As to what persons may do or should refrain from, a

good maxim is supplied by the Roman moralist; "Bene præcipiunt qui vetant quicquam agere, quod dubites æquum sit an iniquum." St. Paul speaks even more to the point, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

I will only detain you with one word.

For myself, I trust that I have been guided rightly in my language respecting this Divine institution, of which I have endeavoured, feebly, I fear, in performance, but earnestly in intention, to set forth the origin, history, and present obligation. My prayer has been and will be that of Augustine, "Domine Deus, quæcunque dixi de Tuo, agnoscant et Tui: si quæ de meo, et Tu ignosce et Tui."

To you if there is anything further that I would say, it is briefly comprehended in my text; "This is the Day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it," not as servants but as sons. The day of our Lord's Resurrection, and the weekly earnest of our own. The day which, treading in the scripturally recorded footsteps of the Apostles, the Church throughout the world has acknowledged for eighteen centuries, and in which, even in the worst of times, God's Saints have found rest and strength for life's contests, spiritual and bodily. The day which reminds men that they are heirs of God, joint heirs with Christ, the Son of God, the Son of Man, and members one

of another. The day which, though it be not the Sabbath, may have all the glorious things said of it which were said of the Sabbath, and so is to be "a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable." The day on which St. John, even while on earth, "was in the Spirit." The day which, above all days, whether ordinary, or stamped with Ecclesiastical honor, is the day of the Holy Eucharist, of united prayer, charitable deeds, self-meditation, devout perusal of Scripture on the one hand; the day of Christian rest, Christian loving-kindness, Christian cheerfulness, and harmless relaxation, on the other. The day which draws us closest to God; but which at the same time reminds us that God is brought near to us in Christ, who was manifest in the flesh for our sakes, who did truly rise again from the dead, and as Man is at the right hand of the Father. The day which, in our foolishness, we fancy we have adopted from expediency, or utility, or on political or sanitary grounds, or the like, but which we really owe to our moral wants, and to our moral sense, our moral wants discovered to us, our moral sense guided and directed to a particular issue, by the Holy Spirit, speaking in Scripture and by the Apostles.

"Let no man judge us in respect of the Sabbath Days;" but let no man deprive us of the Lord's Day.

NOTES.

NOTES.

LECTURE I.

Page 2, *line* 25. As, for instance, the Cathedral at Chartres. Not long ago, one of the *ciceroni* of that place declared to me that the whole edifice is attributable to Bishop Fulbert, A.D. 1029. That Prelate, indeed, built the crypt, but the church generally belongs to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; and the north spire was raised in A.D. 1514. The Cathedral at Poictiers is said to have been founded by Henry II. of England, but nearly all of it, except the north door, seems to be of a later date. Traditions connect a certain church at Milan with St. Ambrose, but they evidently relate to a structure of an earlier period. The "miraculous beam" at Christchurch Priory Church, Hampshire, is found in a part of the church plainly of the fifteenth century, whereas the original church to which the legend refers, was built by Ralph, Bishop of Durham, in the time of William Rufus.

Page 2, *line* 29. '*Septimontium.*' Taken strictly, this festival preserved the remembrance of a time when the Capitoline, Quirinal, and Viminal hills were not yet incorporated with Rome. It referred to the seven original hills or districts, Palatium, Velia, Cermalus, Cœlius, Fagutal, Oppius, Cispius. See Niebuhr, History of Rome, Hare and Thirlwall's translation, vol. i. p. 382, edit. 1831.

Page 2, *line* ult. Virg. Georg. II. 535. Compare, also, Horace, Carm. Sæcul.:

"Dîs, quibus septem placuere colles."

Page 5, *line* 4. 'Ps. cxviii. 24.' I do not quote this verse in the way that the Fathers often do, as a direct prophecy of the Lord's Day. I only adopt it as a description of personal feeling in reference to that day. Hengstenberg, ("The Lord's Day," Martin's translation, pp. 83, 84), animadverts upon its employment as an argument by Dwight and others. Even granting the Psalm in which it occurs to be thoroughly of a Messianic character, "The Day" is a term which would refer quite as well to

the annual as to the weekly celebration of the Lord's resurrection. This, however, need not prevent our spiritualizing the verse either here, or in the Eighth Lecture.

Page 6, *line* 6. On the *first view*, see Lecture V. pp. 192, 193 ; VII. p. 290. Fuller, vol. vi. p. 103, Brewer's edit. makes this view to be a reaction from Saturday-Sabbatarianism. It did re-appear in that way, but it had been known before. In fact Daniel Cawdrey is a witness to this, and makes Saturday-Sabbatarianism a reaction from it. "There is," says he, "a tract by a Sabbatarian Anabaptist, (for such they say he is), with this title, 'The Doctrine of the Fourth Commandment,' wherein he pleads strongly for the Saturday Sabbath. It seems the Anabaptists, who usually cry down the Sabbath either as anti-Christian or ceremonial, begin to see the necessitie of a Sabbath ; and will rather return to the old Sabbath of the Jews than have none at all." The name of this writer appears from the margin to be J. Ockford, but I have not seen his tract. See the preface to the Second Volume of Cawdrey's "Sabbatum Redivivum."

Compare Jewel's Apol. Part III. "Fatemur quidem novas quasdam et non antea auditas sectas, Anabaptistas, Libertinos, Mennonios, Zuenkfeldianos, statim ad exortum Evangelii exstitisse. Verum agimus Deo nostro gratias; satis jam orbis terrarum videt, nos nec peperisse, nec docuisse, nec aluisse ista monstra." And Bishop Prideaux, "Oratio Septima—De Sabbato," p. 64. "Quid enim attinet Anabaptistas, Familistas, Schwenckfeldistas insectari, qui in diebus omnibus promiscuè habendis licentiam intromittunt Ethnicam ? Aut è contrà Sabbatarios conclamatos protrahere in proscenium, qui Sabbatizando Judaismum revocarent ?" And Heylin, p. 460. "Some sectaries, since the Reformation, have gone further yet, and would have had all days alike as unto their use, all equally to be regarded, and reckoned that the Lord's Day, as the Church continued it, was a Jewish ordinance thwarting the doctrine of St. Paul, who seemed to them to abrogate that difference of days which the Church retained. This was the fancy, or the frenzy rather, of the Anabaptists, taking the hint, perhaps, from something which had been formerly delivered by some wiser men ; and after them, of the Swinckfieldians, and the Familists ; as in the times before, of the Petrobrussians, and, (if Waldensis wrong him not), of Wiclif also."

Gaspard de Schwenckfeld was born, A.D. 1490, in Silesia. He

was originally a follower of Luther, but separated himself from him, and founded a religious sect, so extravagant, that almost every one armed themselves against him. He died at Ulm, A.D. 1561. Mosheim, Part II. Cent. 16, chap. i. §. 23, gives a more favorable account of him. But see Middleton's "Family of Love," and a curious note by the Rev. A. Dyce.

Page 6, *line* 23. On the *second view*, see Lecture VII. p. 287. There was, until recently, in the department of the Rolls, a person who belonged to the sect of Saturday-Sabbath Christians, or pure Sabbatarians. He would on no account do any work on Saturday. This produced a difficulty; but, on Lord Langdale's representation, that he was really a well informed man, and valuable in his position, he was allowed to keep his Sabbath. He would have worked on Sunday without scruple; but this was not required of him, of course. It is a curious fact, that he had applied to the Jews for admission into their body, but had been rejected by them.

Compare the following from Thorndike, "Of the Principles of Christian Truth," Works, Oxford edit. vol. ii. p. 416. "And surely those simple people who of late times have taken upon them to keep the Saturday, though it were in truth and effect no less than the renouncing of their Christianity, yet, in reason, did no more than pursue the grounds which their predecessors had laid, and draw the conclusion which necessarily follows upon these premises; that if the Fourth Commandment be in force, then either the Saturday is to be kept, or the Jews were never tied to keep it." *

Page 7, *line* 11. 'Theophilus Brabourne.' See Lecture VII. p. 287.

Page 7, *line* 15. For the *third view*, see Lectures VI. p. 232, and VII. pp. 271, *seq.*; and for the "Westminster Confession," Lecture VII. pp. 256, *seq.*

Page 7, *line* 29. 'Dr. Nicholas Bownd.' Lectures VI. p. 232, and VII. pp. 275, *seq.*

Page 8, *line* 4. 'Daniel Cawdrey and Herbert Palmer.' See Lectures III. p. 78, and VII. p. 289.

* Alicubi Judaicum Sabbatum in usum revocarant, fenestris clausis Colcestriæ ipsum Judaismum propagant, et proselytos faciunt. Honor Reggii [Georgii Horn] de Statu Eccles. Britannic. hodierno, p. 102, Dantisci, 1647.

Page 8, *line* 7. For the *fourth view*, see Lecture VII. especially pp. 296, *seq.*

Page 8, *line* 23. 'The Sabbath was made for man,' &c. This text is discussed in Lecture IV. p. 164.

Page 8, *line* 25. 'Let no man judge you in respect of the Sabbath-days,' &c. This text is discussed in Lecture V. p. 178.

Page 9, *line* 26. 'Bp. Horsley,' in his "Three Sermons on Mark ii. 27." See Lectures VII. p. 295, and VIII. p. 340.

Page 9, *line* 27. 'Bp. Jebb,' in his "Two Sermons on Isaiah lviii. 13, 14." See Lecture VII. p. 295.

Page 9, *line* 27. 'Dr. Burton,' in his "Advice for the proper observance of Sunday," published by the Christian Knowledge Society, No. 261. See Lecture VII. p. 295.

Page 10, *line* 4. 'A season of severity and self-denial, as in Scotland.' See Lecture VII. pp. 290, 291.

Page 10, *line* 6. For the *fifth view*, see Lecture V. especially pp. 178, *seq.*

Page 11, *line* 11. 'Rev. i. 10.' This text is discussed in Lecture II. p. 45, and Lecture VI. p. 242.

Page 12, *line* 9. 'Dr. Heylin.' "History of the Sabbath."

Page 12, *line* 9. 'Bp. Francis White.' "A Treatise of the Sabbath Day, containing a Defence of the Orthodoxall Doctrine of the Church of England against Sabbatarian Novelty." He also wrote "An Examination and Confutation of a Lawless Pamphlet, intituled 'A brief Answer to a late Treatise on the Sabbath-Day.'" See Lecture VII. p. 288.

Page 12, *line* 10. 'Bp. Sanderson,' in his "Opinion upon certain Cases of Conscience on the Sabbatarian Question." Works, vol. v. Oxford edition. See also Lectures V. p. 189, and VII. p. 289.

Page 12, *line* 14. 'Abp. Whately.' "Thoughts on the Sabbath." See also Lectures V. p. 189, VII. pp. 295, 296, 301.

Page 12, line 25. 'Dr. Arnold,' in his "Letter to his Sister, *Lady Cavan," Stanley's Life*, vol. i. p. 320; his three "Letters *to Mr. W. L. Newton," vol. ii. pp. 198, seq.*, and his "Sermon *on Genesis ii. 3,"* vol. iii. Sermon 22. See also Lecture V. *pp. 187, 191.*

Page 13, *line* 18. 'Another writer,' the late Mr. Baden Powell, "Christianity without Judaism." See also Lectures II. pp. 67, 69; and V. p. 183.

Page 13, *line* 24. 'Abp. Bramhall,' in his discourse entitled "The Controversies about the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, with their respective Obligations," &c. Vol. v. of Works; Oxford edition. See also Lectures IV. pp. 134, 136, V. pp. 187, 211, 212.

Page 14, *line* 26. 'Archdeacon Paley.' "Moral Philosophy." B. V. c. 7. See Lecture II. p. 53, in the notes to which the passage here alluded to is quoted. See also Lecture IV. p. 137.

Page 14, *line* 27. 'Bp. Prideaux.' "Oratio Septima—De Sabbato." See also Lectures VII. pp. 287, 288, and VIII. pp. 310—313.

Page 14, *line* 28. 'Bp. Cosin,' in his "Letter to Mr. Collins concerning the Sabbath," and in his "Letter to Mr. Wood." Works, vol. iv. Oxford edition. Again in vol. v, "A Determination on the Immutable Obligation of the Lord's Day." See also Lecture VII. p. 288.

Page 14, *line* ult. 'Richard Baxter.' "The Divine Appointment of the Lord's Day, proved, as a separated Day for Holy Worship, especially in the Church Assemblies. And consequently the Cessation of the Seventh Day Sabbath." See also Lecture VII. p. 288.

Page 16, *line* 4. 'Of course I have not intended this enumeration to be an exhaustive one.'

Another view is that of E. W. Hengstenberg. See Lecture VI. pp. 242—247. This I have omitted here, because it is seldom found in England; though, indeed, a friend writes to me thus: "My present way of thinking is, that the observance of the Lord's Day depends not so much upon institution, whether Ecclesiastical, Mosaic, or ante-Mosaic, as upon the instinct of Christendom falling into the track of an ancient institution, and adopting of it merely the septimanal form."

For notices of the views of Hooker and of Bp. Stillingfleet, see Lecture VII. p. 280 and p. 289.

Joseph Mede, "Discourse XV. on Ezek. xx. 20," supposes the Sabbath to include two respects of time; first, the *quotum*, one day of seven, or the seventh day after six days' labour; secondly, the *designation*, or pitching that seventh upon the day which we call Saturday. In the former aspect the Israelites acknowledged God as the Creator, and followed His example in their proportions of work and rest, Exod. xxxi. 16, 17; in the latter,

they had reference to God's deliverance of them from Egypt, which he conjectures took place upon that particular day of the seven, Deut. v. 15. He says that it is possible that the Sabbath of the *quotum* and the Sabbath of the *designation* may have coincided—(*i.e.* that the day marked as the Jewish Sabbath in the way he supposes may really have been the seventh in an hebdomadal cycle, dating from the creation), but again that they may not. All this he brings forward to show that Jews and Christians may agree as to the *quotum*, but differ as to the *designation;* and that, as the former *designated* the Saturday as their Sabbath, because they were on it delivered from temporal bondage, so the latter *designate* the Sunday as their Sabbath, because on it they were delivered from sin by Christ's resurrection from the dead. He has, however, quite forgotten to quote any passage for the Christian's designation of Sunday in connexion with a Sabbatical *quotum*, which is at all parallel to that in Deut. v. 15.

Dr. Samuel Lee, late Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, supposes (1) that the Patriarchs had a Sabbath-Day; (2) that the Heathen inherited it from them, but perverted it to Sun worship, calling it "Dies Solis;" (3) that the Patriarchs and the Heathen together represented the world; (4) that the Jewish Sabbath, which falls on our Saturday, was chosen peculiarly for a temporary covenant and a temporary dispensation; and (5) that on the annulling of such temporary covenant and dispensation, the original Sabbath, *i.e.* the "Dies Solis," was restored to its dignity. In other words, that the Christian Festival of the First Day of the week is the primal Sabbath of God; and that in keeping it holy Christians are, unconsciously, fulfilling the Fourth Commandment in the very letter. I have mentioned this collection of assumptions as a fiction, in Lecture V. p. 204; and I have thought it right to state it at this length, in order to justify that epithet. See Dr. Lee's "Commencement Sermon," on "the Duty of observing the Christian Sabbath," showing "that the primitive Sabbath Day of the Patriarchs was modified to suit the circumstances of the egress from Egypt; and that it resumed its universality and day of observance under the Christian Dispensation." Camb. 1834. Dr. Lee says that "The opinion which supposes our *Sunday* to fall on the day once celebrated as the patriarchal Sabbath Day is by no means new

or singular." He then quotes Capellus, Archbishop Ussher, and Gale, and concludes a long note as follows:—"As the ancient Sabbath had been sacred from the beginning, and had lost nothing of its primitive sanctions by having been accommodated to the times of the egress, and as that system had come to an end, that day would now necessarily recur, by virtue of the precept which at first sanctified and set it apart. There would consequently be no necessity for any new commandment, in the New Testament, again to sanction it for the future observance of the Church."

Page 16, *line* penult. The word *Sabbatarian* is throughout these Lectures employed not invidiously, but σαφηνείας ἕνεκεν καὶ τοῦ εὐπαρακολουθήτου, to denote those who seek for the Lord's Day *a directly* Mosaic origin, or who find *direct* precepts for its observance in the law of the Sabbath. The word *Dominical* is intended to apply to those who make the Lord's Day a purely Christian institution, whether originated by the Apostolic or by the post-Apostolic Church.

Page 19. Aristotle, Eth. Nic. x. c. 1.

Page 19, *line* 14. 'That the Lord's Day,' &c. } See Lec-
Page 19, *line* 25. 'That in the two centuries,' &c. } ture II.

Page 20, *line* 4. 'That after the first three centuries,' &c. See Lecture III.

Page 20, *line* 11. 'Afterwards they,' &c. See Lecture III. *ad finem*, and Lecture VI. *init.*

Page 20, *line* 21. 'That Sabbatarianism, of every phase,' &c. See Lectures V. *ad finem*, VI. and VII.

Page 20, *line* 24. 'By Knox himself,' &c. See Lecture VII. pp. 268—270.

Page 20, *line* 29. 'That Sabbatarianism, *as a dogma*,' &c. See Lecture VII.

Page 21, *line* 23. 'That Sabbatarianism, *as a practical tenet*,' &c. See Lecture VII.

Page 22, *line* 9. 'That meanwhile,' &c. See Lectures V. *ad finem*, and VII. pp. 257—262.

Page 22, *line* 15. 'That this assertion,' &c. See Lecture V. *ad finem.*

Page 22, *line* 23. 'That the position,' &c. See Lecture V. p. 175.

Page 22, *line* ult. 'That Sabbatarianism, the strange varieties,' &c. See Lectures III. VI. VII.

Page 23, *line* 4. 'That the mention,' &c.
Page 23, *line* 10. 'That this assertion,' &c.
Page 23, *line* 13. 'That it is strengthened,' &c
Page 23, *line* 19. 'That the Sabbath, as it appears,' &c.
Page 23, *line* 28. 'Yet, that the occurrence,' &c.
Page 24, *line* 8. 'That the Sabbath, as it appears,' &c.
} See Lecture IV.

Page 24, *line* 14. 'Yet that the political and ceremonial elements,' &c. See Lectures IV. p. 170, V. pp. 182, 201.

Page 24, *line* 18. 'That the Creation labour and rest,' &c. See Lectures IV. V.

Page 25, *line* 1. 'That to state,' &c. See Lecture II.

Page 25, *line* 9. 'That though the Sabbath,' &c. See Lectures II. and V. *ad finem.*

Page 25, *line* 17. 'That the same analogy,' &c. See Lecture VIII. p. 320.

Page 25, *line* 22. 'That on the Sabbath itself,' &c. See Lectures IV. and VII.

Page 26, *line* 1. 'That still, though the Lord's Day,' &c. See Lectures III. pp. 103, 104, and VI.

Page 26, *line* 9. 'That the origin and obligation,' &c. See Lectures V. VII. and VIII.

Page 26, *line* 21. 'That the Lord's Day,' &c. See Lectures V. and VI.

Page 26, *line* 27. 'That the civil power,' &c.
Page 27, *line* 3. 'Yet that, even here,' &c.
Page 27, *line* 6. 'That the subject of prohibitions,' &c.
Page 27, *line* 13. 'That the exercise,' &c.
Page 27, *line* 17. 'That care should be taken,' &c.
} See Lecture VIII.

Page 27, *line* 29. 'That such an injunction as the following,' &c. See Lecture VIII. p. 334.

Page 28, *line* 5. 'That since much will,' &c. See Lecture VIII. p. 339.

Page 28, *line* 10. 'That the present state,' &c. See Lecture VIII.

Page 28, *line* 33. 'That in reference,' &c. See Lecture VIII.

Page 29, *line* 12. 'The Sundays of man's life,' &c. George Herbert, "*Sunday.*"

LECTURE II.

Page 31, *line* 27. Dean Hook says, "We prove the Divine authority of Confirmation by precisely the same argument as that by which we establish the Divine authority of the Lord's Day,—the ratification in Heaven of what has been done in Christ's name and by His authority upon earth," (*The Lord's Day*, p. 8). And he afterwards says, (p. 12), "It is an ordinance of the Church." But he does not, I think, distinguish, as I have endeavoured to do in the text of this Lecture, between the Apostolical and the post-Apostolical Church; and accordingly, his assertion would either raise all ordinances of the Church to the rank of Confirmation and the Lord's Day, and certain others, which I have called Scriptural, Apostolical, and Divine; or lower Confirmation, and the Lord's Day, &c. to the rank of ordinances Ecclesiastical in the common sense of that word.

Page 32, *line* penult. '*They* might say,' &c. This point is treated very ably by Dr. Thomas Young, in his "Dies Dominica," lib. i. c. 7. p, 30—33, &c. He thus sums up his argument: "Dies Dominicus itaque ab Apostolis tanquam a fidelissimis Ecclesiæ Christianæ architectis, potestate extraordinariâ, quæ jam non durat in Ecclesiâ, et Spiritûs Sancti inspiratione, est institutus: ut Christiani, auctoritate non humanâ, sed divinâ, ad convocationes sanctas, et ad privata pietatis exercitia eo die celebranda obligarentur. *Apostolica gratia*, inquit Ambrosius, (Hexaemer, lib. iv. c. 4), *mortuos excitavit*, quæ quanquam non erat Apostolorum sed Christi gratia, ut ipsi fatentur Apostoli, Actorum cap. III. vv. 12, 16, vocatur Apostolica, quia in ipsos erat effusa, ejusque ope illi mortuos resuscitârunt: ita hîc *Dominica* institutio vocatur Apostolica, non quod sit mera Apostolorum, quâ erant Christiani, ordinatio, sed quia a Christo per illos potestate extraordinariâ instructos fuit instituta."

Richard Baxter's opinion as to the Divine character of the appointment of the Lord's Day is given in the text of Lecture I. p. 15. In the preface to his own work he speaks highly of the treatise by Dr. Thomas Young, quoted above—and indeed

himself issued a translation of it. (Little is known of that writer. He chose to assume the disguise of "*Theophilus Loncardiensis*," probably in allusion to his Scottish extraction, and birth at Loncarty.) Its full title is, "Dies Dominica, sive succincta narratio ex S. Scripturarum, et venerandæ antiquitatis Patrum testimoniis concinnata, et duobus libris distincta: quorum priori, diei Dominicæ observationem ab ipsis Apostolis, Ecclesiâ que Christianâ continuâ serie solennem fuisse habitam, ejus institutionem fuisse divinam, et quæ ejus solemnitatem impediant, declaratur: posteriori verò, in quibus ejus sanctificatio consistat ostenditur, &c." But see Lecture VII. p. 288.

Page 34, *line* 26. 'They are therefore not merely Ecclesiastical,' &c.

The remarks of Dr. Hawkins, "Bampton Lectures for 1840," Sermon V. pp. 157—162, are well worth noting:

"We have absolutely no need of such an ample array of Scriptural proof, to convince us of the Divine original of an Ordinance, as we might have desired for our belief in a Revealed Doctrine. Nay, we may not only acquiesce in a less amount of proof, but even observe . . . in such a difference one of the numerous instances of a merciful accommodation to our wants, everywhere to be traced throughout the whole economy of Revelation.

"The religious observance of *the Lord's Day*, for instance, is almost universally acknowledged as a Christian duty throughout the Christian world. And a cheering thought it is, amidst our manifold divisions, to observe scarcely a single sect, and not a single Church, interrupting in this great article of belief the general concord; millions of our brethren offering at the same hour their solemn protest against irreligion and idolatry, and suspending their cares and toils to celebrate the Redemption of the world, and adore with one consent the one true God, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier. Is it even necessary that the duty should be explicitly enjoined in the Christian Scriptures, which even without a specific command can be distinctly perceived, and this not only by the considerate Christian, but even by the Statesman, the Moralist, the Philanthropist, to be at once a duty and a blessing? To the poor, that is, to the great majority of our race in every land, and under every condition in society, this day of religious rest is simply a boon. If a seventh

part were added to the amount of labour, although the number of poor might be increased, their temporal condition would be exactly what it is. But suppose the weekly rest abandoned, a seventh part would not therefore be added to the produce of our labour; for the physician knows that this merciful provision for a remission of human toil is absolutely necessary to the best exertion of the strength of man, bodily or intellectual. And how much more does every religious man feel it to be essential to the well-being of our higher nature, to the health of the soul, and to our preparation for that future existence, which is our real life!

"But then, assuredly the Statesman and the Philanthropist would never of themselves have devised or enjoined the ordinance. Nor can even its external observance, greatly as it may be promoted, be effectually secured by any efforts of theirs. We must look to higher sources for the origin of the duty and its obligation. We trace back, accordingly, the general religious observance of the Lord's Day to the very era of the promulgation of the Gospel. We find the universality of the practice recognised by the earliest extant writings, genuine or apocryphal, by Ignatius, Justin, the Epistle attributed to Barnabas, the so-called Apostolical Constitutions, as well as by various other works of the second and third and succeeding centuries. And this universal observance of the Lord's Day is rendered especially striking, not only by varieties of practice in other cases, but even in respect of the Jewish Sabbath; the observance of which we find retained by many in early times together with that of the Lord's Day, then discontinued, then revived, and revived amidst so much discrepancy of opinion, that the day was regarded as a Fast in the Western Churches, in the Eastern as a Festival. Why this difference, but because the universal observation of the Lord's Day was based upon apostolical authority, whilst the same Apostles, wheresoever the continued observance of the Jewish Sabbath did not appear to undermine, as in the Galatian Church, the foundations of the Gospel, permitted the practice gradually to disappear before the increasing light of Christianity. Add then but a few recognitions in the Christian Scriptures themselves of the actual observance of the Lord's Day even in the age of the Apostles, and with their sanction, nay, apparently, with the implied sanction of our Lord Himself and of the Holy

Spirit, and we have all the proof which we really require of its Divine authority.

"But can we not also support its Divine obligation by cogent arguments derived from the Old Scriptures? Undoubtedly, I conceive, we may. Yet these do not appear to be the proofs by which the duty was at first established. They were not its original authority and foundation. For very remarkable has been in this respect the difference of views in later and in primitive times; all indeed agreeing in the same conclusion, but reaching it by very different means. In modern times, it is not uncommon to appeal directly to the Fourth Commandment in the Decalogue as a decisive authority for the observance of the Lord's Day; and again, to assert without hesitation the existence of a Primitive Sabbath, commanded and observed from the era of the Creation, and thence to infer the universal obligation binding on all men in all ages to hallow one day in seven to the service of their Maker. The Fathers, on the contrary, interpreted otherwise the apparent command to this effect in the Book of Genesis, and denied the existence of a Patriarchal Sabbath; whilst, instead of appealing to the Fourth Commandment, or considering the Lord's Day to be substituted for the Jewish Sabbath, they endeavoured, some of them at least, to prove the foreshown superiority of the eighth day, *i. e.* the Lord's Day, above the Sabbath of the Jews by weak and fanciful arguments, drawn from the command to circumcise a child on the eighth day, or the supply of manna vouchsafed for the first time on the eighth day and not poured down at all upon the seventh."

I have quoted this interesting passage as strongly corroborative of the view taken in the text of this Lecture, that the Lord's Day is possessed of a Divine sanction in right of its being of Apostolical institution, or at least of Apostolical observance. I do not follow the learned author in his subsequent remarks upon the probable existence of a Patriarchal Sabbath; indeed, it almost seems to me that he employs alternately the Christian Sabbath to prove the Patriarchal, and the Patriarchal to prove the Christian Sabbath. But I cannot help subjoining a further extract. I consider Dr. Hawkins' testimony to be the more valuable, because I was not acquainted with his Lectures until I had composed, and in great part delivered, my own.

"With respect to the Mosaic Sabbath, the Fourth Commandment is not, I apprehend, the true foundation of our Christian duty. Nay, I dare not appeal directly to that, as a commandment obligatory upon Christian men, which no Christian Church has ever yet enjoined or observed. Neither may any Christian Church presume to teach as a Divine commandment one portion of a positive precept, whilst of her own authority she abrogates another. That is the privilege of inspiration alone. We say, indeed, and we say justly, that not hallowing the seventh day, yet hallowing one day in seven, we fulfil the spirit of the law. But a positive institution, if obligatory at all, is to be obeyed also in the letter; and what now appears so slight a change, (to say nothing here of the total abandonment in the Christian Church of the awful strictness in the commanded observance of the Mosaic rest,) the mere alteration of the day would scarcely, in the first instance, have appeared a trivial change. . . . It is to the spirit of the commandment that we appeal, not to its letter. The letter we believe to have been abrogated, but the spirit survives. The spirit of that command was not to be abrogated, which was distinguished in so marked a manner from the positive institutions of the law; pronounced by the awful voice of God, placed alone among moral precepts, the authoritative declarations of our natural duties, itself unconnected with shadowy and typical rites, which were partial enactments temporary in their very nature, whilst this rested upon the ground of universal religion, applicable alike to all the sons of men. The spirit of this great command survives, accordingly, in another ordinance equally of Divine appointment, but more spiritual and more comprehensive; pointing to the doctrines of Redemption, yet still embracing everything which pervaded the Mosaic precept, of glory to the Creator and benefit to His creatures, even the lowest of His creatures, those whom we too frequently oppress, but who are never forgotten by Him. In this sense, and in this sense alone, the Church of England, I believe, prays that we may observe the Fourth Commandment, the spirit, namely, of the Mosaic Law, as it still lives in the Christian ordinance of the Lord's Day.—(Pp. 163—165.)

* * * *

"Nevertheless, the prime and independent proof of its Divine original remains, as before, in the universal consent of the

Christian Church, but, not resting there, traced up to Apostolic practice, and implied Apostolic authority.—(P. 165.)

* * * *

"We may well esteem this sacred ordinance far above every other, which can make no such appeal to Holy Scripture; valuing others, indeed, in proportion to their uses, and importance, and universality, and antiquity, as ordinances of the Church, but reverencing this, and this alone, among Christian festivals, as of Divine authority.—(P. 166.)

* * * *

"The recognition of an ordinance in Holy Scripture, even without express record of a command for its observance, sets it upon an eminence far above those upon which Holy Scripture has been silent; and thus the Ember days, for example, and the Friday fast, are not to be compared with the Lord's Day."—(P. 182.)

The language of Dr. George Cook, author of "The History of the Reformation in Scotland," is also very much to my purpose. After speaking of the natural duty of worshipping God at some time, and of the necessity of a stated time for performing such worship, he lays down that stated times are a matter of positive institution, and may vary where revelation does not interpose. Under the religion of Moses, (and possibly before), revelation did interpose. The Sabbath, or seventh day, was divinely instituted, and continued obligatory so long as the dispensation lasted to which it belonged. It was then abrogated. And "mankind thus returned to what may be called their condition by nature. It was their duty at set times to worship God, but these times might have been differently appointed from what they had been; any day of the week might have been chosen, or any other proportion might have been consecrated." He then goes through the New Testament evidence as to the selection of the first day of the week, which he confirms by the testimony of Pliny and of many early writers; and concludes, that not merely was that day the most likely one to have been selected under the circumstances, but that it was, "from the commencement of the Christian Church, the day marked out by Divine authority for performing that duty of public worship, which is, from the constitution of nature, always binding upon mankind."—*A General and Historical View of Christianity, by George Cook, D.D.*, vol. ii. chap. x. pp. 284—290.

And again, "The amount of this whole disquisition is, that the observance of the first day of the week, as a day of worship, is founded upon the law of nature, conjoined with the fact, that it is plain, from Scripture, that this particular day was set apart for that purpose by the Apostles, and that in so far it may be considered of Divine appointment; but that it is not enforced as was the Jewish Sabbath, to which, in primitive times, it was uniformly set in opposition; and that it is left very much to the discretion of particular churches, or to the consciences of individuals, to determine how large a portion of the day should be devoted to religious services, and in what manner the remainder of it is to be occupied."—Pp. 319, 320.

Dr. George Cook was the leader of the Moderate party of the Kirk of Scotland from 1834 till his death in 1845. He was one of the most learned ministers of the Kirk, and succeeded Dr. Chalmers as Professor of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrews.

But to come to older writers.

Bp. Prideaux says: "Nec tamen satisfacere videtur *nuda Ecclesiæ constitutio* quæ rescindi potest eâdem facilitate quâ coaluerit," and then he goes on to say, "Dicatur quippiam esse jure divino duobus modis, vel quod institutum habet, idque vel expressè vel certâ deductione erutum, vel exemplum continuatâ Ecclesiæ praxi omni sæculo commendatum. Institutum Diei Dominicæ, sive expressum sive elicitum, ostendat in sacris Literis qui invenerit. Exempla sunt satis obvia, quibus nitatur praxis Ecclesiæ."—*De Sabbato*, § 7.

Bp. Cosin says in his letter to Dr. Collins: "You seem to rank *Dies Dominicus* among other *Ceremonies;* and so let it be: but let it be a ceremony instituted by Christ and His Apostles withal, and then there is not any power in the Church to take it away."—*Works, Oxford Edition*, vol. iv. p. 461.

Page 35, *line* 4. 'Such things connected with the celebration of matters contained under the two higher classes as do not actually appear in Scripture, and so are not of the essence of those matters.' To the instances given in the text of the Lecture might be added "the time of the day at which the Holy Eucharist may be celebrated," a point which is further discussed in a note to Lecture VIII. p. 330.

This, however, seems to be a good opportunity of giving

Richard Baxter's opinion. After asserting very strongly the Divine origin of the Lord's Day, through the practice and authority of the Apostles, he supposes an objector to say:

"That other things also were then taken for Apostolical Traditions, and were customs of the Universal Church, as well as this, (the Lord's Day); which things we now renounce as superstitious."

And his answer is as follows:—

"1. It is but a few things that come under this charge, viz. the Unction, white Garment, with the Taste of milk and honey at Baptism; Adoration towards the East, and that standing; and not kneeling on the Lord's Day; and the Anniversary observation of Easter and Whitsuntide. And the last is but the keeping of one or two Lord's Days in the year with some note of distinction from the rest, so far as there was any agreement in it.

"2. These are not usually by the ancients called Apostolical Traditions, but Customs of the Universal Church.

"3. When they are called Traditions from the Apostles, it is not with any assertion that the Apostles instituted them, but that they are supposed to be from their times, because their original is not known.

"4. The ancients join not the Lord's Day with these, but take the Lord's Day for an Apostolical Institution written in Scripture, though the universal practice of all Churches fullier deliver the certain history of it. But the rest they take for unwritten Customs, as distinct from Scripture Ordinances. (As Epiphanius fully sheweth.)

"5. Most Christians are agreed, that if these later could be proved Apostolical Institutions for the Church Universal, it would be our duty to use them, though they were not in Scripture. So that we reject them only for want of such proof; but the proof of the Lord's Day separation being far better, (by concurrence of Scripture and all ancient History), it followeth not that we must doubt of that which hath full and certain proof, because we must doubt of that which wants it.

"6. And if it were necessary that they stood or fell together, (as it is not), it were necessary that we did receive those three or four Ceremonies, for the sake of the Lord's Day, which hath so great evidence, rather than that we cast off the Lord's Day, because of these Ceremonies. Not only because there is more good in the Lord's Day than there is evil to be any way sus-

pected by a doubter in these Ceremonies; but especially, because the evidence for the day is so great, that if the said Ceremonies had but the same, they were undoubtedly of Divine authority or institution. In a word, I have showed you somewhat of the evidence for the Lord's Day. Do you now show me the like *for them*, and then I will prove that both must be received. But if you cannot, do not pretend a parity.

"7. And the same Churches laying by the Customs aforesaid, or most of them, did show that they took them not indeed for Apostolical Institutions, as they did the Lord's Day, which they continued to observe; not as a ceremony, but as a necessary thing."

Baxter then touches upon a point which I mention in p. 41—that certain practices current in Apostolic days were, and were intended to be, merely temporary. For he proceeds:—

"8. And the Ancient Churches did believe, that even in the Apostles' days some things were used as indifferent which were mutable, and were not laws, but temporary customs. And some things were necessary, settled by law for perpetuity. Of the former kind they thought were, the 'greeting one another with a holy kiss,' the women's praying covered with a veil, of which the Apostle saith that it was then and there so decent, that the contrary would have been unseemly, and the Churches of God had no such custom, by which he answereth the contentious, yet in other countries, where custom altereth the signification, it may be otherwise. Also that a man wear not long hair; and that they have a Love-Feast on the Lord's Day, (which yet Paul seemeth to begin to alter in his rebuke of the abuses of it, 1 Cor. c. xi.)."—*The Divine Appointment of the Lord's Day*, pp. 49—52.

Page 35, *line* 26. 'I shall scarcely, I think, be misunderstood,' &c. In a tract by Bp. Ironside, "Seven Questions of the Sabbath," &c., pp. 172, seq. a distinction like that given in this Lecture is laid down. He supposes the Apostles to have had a three-fold inspiration—as Apostles, as Pastors, as individual men. Their inspiration as Apostles was peculiar to themselves, and rendered them infallible. That which they had as Pastors they share with Ecclesiastical Synods and later Pastors; as possessing this, they were not infallible. They had also the same spiritual aid which is vouchsafed to ordinary Christians. The Bishop makes them establish the Lord's Day, not in right of their

chief or Apostolical inspiration, but in right of their secondary or Ecclesiastical inspiration. This is not the view taken in these Lectures. But I quote what he says as an evidence, that the distinction between inspiration strictly Apostolical, and that which is merely Ecclesiastical, has appeared in the Church. Of course I should object to this secondary sort of inspiration being attributed to them; or at any rate to the doctrine that in right of *it* they established the Lord's Day. It would thus be made an ordinance not Divine, not binding on the Church for ever, but disciplinal and mutable.

Page 39, *line* 20. 'Whether from accident,' &c.

Richard Baxter writes thus:—

"The Lord's Day seemeth to me to be as it were *conceived* on the day of Christ's Resurrection, but *born* on this day of the Holy Ghost's descent. But Dr. Heylin hath one poor reason against it, viz. 'Because it was but an accidental thing that the day fell out that year on the first day.' Answ. 1. Was it not according to the course of Nature? How, then, can that be called accidental? 2. But, however, it was no contingent, accidental thing in his sense that the Holy Ghost was sent down on that day rather than on another. If a sparrow fall not to the ground without God's providence, did God choose that day He knew not why? Or did it fall out hap-hazard, or by chance?"—*The Divine Appointment, &c.* p. 22.

Page 41, *line* 2. 'The Holy Communion and the ἀγάπαι, which at that time were invariably connected, though the latter are now disused.'

It would be foreign to my purpose to enter here upon the various questions which have been raised as to the nature and history of the ἀγάπη. That, as Bingham holds strongly, it was at first invariably connected with the Holy Communion, as asserted in the text, seems to me very probable, from the authorities cited by him, from the scene at Troas, and from the rebuke of the Corinthians. That it was preceded by the Holy Communion, seems also to be established by the fact that the assembly was primarily for religious and secondarily for social purposes; and also by Pliny's statement, that the "*Sacramentum*" came first, and afterwards the "*cibus*." That it should not be confounded with the Holy Communion, is clear from the facts that the two were frequently separated, in point of time,

because of abuses connected with the ἀγάπη; and that these abuses still continuing, the ἀγάπη was disused at length altogether. A trace of it, indeed, still remains in the "pain béni," which is distributed after the Mass in the Churches of France and Savoy. And Dr. Asahel Grant in his *Nestorians*, p. 57, after giving an account of the administration of the Holy Communion, says, "In passing out of the Church, each person received at the door a very thin *leaf* of bread, rolled together, and enclosing a morsel of meat. This was the 'Love-Feast' of the early Christians of the first and second centuries." Another and most painful trace of it appears to exist in the Abyssinian Church. It is thus described by Major W. Cornwallis Harris (*Highlands of Ethiopia*, vol. iii. p. 204): "The Sacrament of the Christ's Supper was then administered, accompanied by rites and ceremonies highly unbecoming the solemnity of this most sacred of Christian institutes. The multitude next proceeded to devour a pile of loaves, and to drain accumulated pitchers of beer, supplied by the neighbouring governors. Here, too, the most indecent excesses were committed. Declaring themselves to have swallowed a specific against intoxication, the clergy indulge to any extent they please, and each priest, vying with his brother in the quantities he shall quaff, avers that if 'the whole of the Lord's bread and the Lord's wine' be not consumed on the spot, a famine will arise throughout the land."

Tertullian, Apol. c. 39, describes an ἀγάπη and its circumstances very beautifully—"Nihil vilitatis, nihil immodestiæ admittit. Non prius discumbitur, quam oratio ad Deum prægustetur. Editur, quantum esurientes cupiunt: bibitur, quantum pudicis est utile. Ita saturantur, ut qui meminerint etiam per noctem adorandum Deum sibi esse. Ita fabulantur, ut qui sciant Dominum audire," &c. St. Chrysostom also gives an account of it and of its origin.

On the whole subject of ἀγάπαι, see Bingham, Christian Antiquities, B. VIII. c. 10 and B. XV. c. 7. Poole's Synopsis, on Matt. xxvi. 26. Thorndike, "The Church's Right to Tithes," sect. 11. (Works, vol. vi. p. 8, Oxf. Edit.) Bunsen's "Hippolytus and his Age," vol. ii. p. 218. Dr. Stanley on 1 Cor. xiv. 26—40, and two articles in the *Christian Remembrancer*, No. XCII., April, 1857, pp. 457, 458, and No. CIX., July, 1860, pp. 194—197.

The definition of a Love-Feast in the current Wesleyan

Catechism is, "An occasional meeting of members of the Wesleyan Society, when each person partakes of bread and water in token of brotherly love, and in imitation of the primitive Christians, (2 Pet. ii. 13; Jude 12), after which, narrations of Christian experience are given."—*Compend. of the Hist. and Pol. of Methodism.*

Page 42, *line* 12. 'This, (says Thorndike very pertinently)' &c. See his treatise, "The Right of the Christian State in Church Matters," sect. 5. (Works, vol. vi. p. 65, Oxf. Edit.)

Page 42, *line* 18. 'The authorized Italian Catechism.' "Dottrina Cristiana breve composta per ordine di Papa Clemente VIII. Dal R. P. Roberto Bellarmino, &c., riveduta, ed approvata dalla Congregazione della Riforma. In Roma, 1836." This Catechism is quoted again in Lecture VI. p. 253.

Page 43, *line* 8. 'Upon the first day of the week,' &c. Macknight thus translates the passage:

"On the first day of the week, let each of you *lay somewhat by itself*, according as he may have prospered, putting it into the treasury, that when I come, there may be then no collections."

And he observes—"The common translation, 'lay by him in store,' is inconsistent with the last part of the verse—for according to that translation, the collections would still have been to make at the Apostle's coming."

Θησαυρίζων he thinks refers to the church's box or treasury.

Finally, he says—"From this passage it is evident, that the Corinthian brethren were in use to assemble on the first day of the week for the purpose of worshipping God. And as the Apostle gave the same order to the Galatians, they likewise must have held their religious assemblies on the first day of the week."

Bishop Hacket has the same argument in his "Fourth Sermon upon the Resurrection," "Century of Sermons," p. 583. So also Dean Owen: "Exercitations concerning the Name, &c. of a Day of Sacred Rest," p. 390. It is observable that in 1 Tim. vi. 19, those who are ready to distribute, willing to communicate, are described as ἀποθησαυρίζοντες, "laying up in store," &c.

Page 44, *line* 2. 'He inculcated it,' &c. See Romans xv. 26, 27.

Page 44, *line* 16. ἐπισυναγωγὴ in Heb. x. 25, may be paralleled by συναγωγὴ in James ii. 2. With the ancient Church,

σύναξις was used for *conventus Ecclesiasticus*—οἱ συναγόμενοι, were *Laici*—the ἐπίσκοπος who held the σύναξις was said συνάγειν —Conf. Franciscus Burmann, "Acad. Disp. p. posterior. Disp. prima de Synagogis." The phrase in 1 Cor. xi. 18, συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, which Dr. Stanley translates, "when you meet assembly wise," affords a presumption that assemblies were usual and regular. (The word ἐπισυναγωγὴ occurs again in 2 Thess. ii. 1, but probably with reference to the gathering to Christ of those who should be yet living at the day of Judgment.)

Page 46, *line* 3. 'He himself was engaged upon it,' &c. Bp. Hacket, (ut suprà). "As the last day of the week, when God rested from His works, was called the Sabbath of the Lord, so it is of much moment to the point that the first day of the week is called the Day of the Lord, or the Lord's Day. 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day,' as it appears Rev. i. 13. John was walking on the sea-shore, meditating on holy things, in the Isle of Patmos. Very probable that there was no solemn meeting to praise God, as it ought to have been, among those pagan islanders, otherwise John had not betaken himself to solitary meditations. But see how he was recompensed, ('Nactus est Doctorem ipsum Deum, quando fortasse deessent quos ipse doceret,') when he was disconsolate, because he wanted auditors to teach, God preached to him the mysteries of the age to come. But to enforce the text forenamed for an argument; we have but two things in the New Testament called the Lord's: the Sacrament is called the Supper of the Lord, i Cor. xi. 20, and this day of Christian assemblies is called the Lord's Day; (the Lord's Prayer and the Lord's House are good phrases, but our own, not the Scripture's;) but as we keep the feast of the Passover no more, but instead thereof eat the Lord's Supper, so neither do we observe the Jews' Sabbath any more, but instead thereof keep the Lord's Day."

In addition to the interpretations of Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα, given in the text, the following fancy is mentioned in a work entitled, "Effigiatio veri Sabbathismi; Authore Roberto Loeo, Exoniensis Eccl. Thesaurario." Lond. 1605. "Sed Domini usitatè in Scripturis is dicitur Dies, quo divinæ potentiæ magnitudò, vel in evertendis apparet improbis, vel in tuendâ elucet bonorum salute . . . . . Dies hic a Joanne Dominici Diei appellatione

insignitus dicatur, quod in eo Deus quam admiranda pro ecclesiæ erat salute facturus declarabat."

Bishop Beveridge, Thes. Theol. on John xx. 21, says very well, "It is called Ἡμέρα Κυριακὴ, Rev. i. 10, as Δεῖπνον Κυριακὸν, 1 Cor. xi. 20, John supposing thereby the day to be well known at the time of his writing."

Page 46, *line* 22. 'As to the prevalence of the Lord's Day being only gradual,' &c. Compare, on the subject of the moderation of the Apostles, Puller, "Mod. of Church of England," p. 275. "Somewhat the like apology was made at the beginning of the Reformation; It was said, that 'as our Saviour did not reveal all things to His disciples till they were able to bear them, and as the Apostles did not of a sudden abolish all the rites of Judaism, but for some time, to gain the Jews, complied with them, and went to the Temple and offered sacrifices; so the people were not to be [over] driven in this change. The clergy must be brought out of their ignorance by degrees; but to drive furiously, and to do all at once, might have spoiled the whole design;' therefore these slow steps were thought the surer and better method." And Dr. Routh, "Rel. Sac." in Melitonis Fragmenta, vol. i. p. 137, writes thus on this point:—"[ὁ περὶ Κυριακῆς] Hoc nomine appellârunt hebdomadale Dominicæ resurrectionis festum ante Melitonem Dionysiumve Corinthium æqualem ejus, S. Joannes, Apoc. i. 10, discipulusque ejus Ignatius in Epist. ad Magnesios, § 9. Qui quidem dies Sacer, cum Apostolicis temporibus institutus esset, atque exinde ab omnibus Christianis observatus, Sabbatum, quod abrogatum fuisse testatur S. Paulus in Epist. ad Col. ii. 16, prorsus exclusit, sed *sensim gradatimque.* Quapropter Melito in libro suo ostendisse existimari possit, quantum dies primus, seu, ut mysticâ ratione eum vocabant, dies octavus, septimum diem dignitate præstaret. Confer Epist. S. Barnabæ adscript. c 15. & S. Basil. M. De. Spir. S. c. 27."

Page 47, *line* 4. 'The regularity of a recognized or established creed.' Dr. Stanley, on 1 Cor. xiv. 26—40, after noticing the simplicity of the primitive services, and enumerating certain particulars, says, "These points are all that we can clearly discern in the worship of apostolic times, with the addition perhaps of the fact mentioned in Acts xx. 7, and confirmed by 1 Cor. xvi. 2, that the first day of the week was specially devoted to these meetings."

Page 47, *line* 8. 'Jericho.' See Joshua vi.

Page 47, *line* 10. 'Athaliah.' See 1 Kings xi. 5, 9.

Page 49, *line* 16. 'A Sabbath of more venerable antiquity,' &c. See Lecture IV.

Page 49, *line* 26. 'The Sabbath virtually subsists,' &c. See Lecture V.

Page 50, *line* 5. 'All days, whether Christian or Jewish,' &c. See Lecture V.

Page 50, *line* 16. 'On the next Sabbath.' Acts xiii. 42. The Greek phrase for this, εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον, has had its meaning much disputed. It seems to be interpreted by verse 44, τῷ ἐρχομένῳ, (corr. ἐχομένῳ) σαββάτῳ, as our version has it. Dr. Burton refers, after Krebsius, to a passage in Josephus, Bell. Jud. v. 4. 2, τῶν μετάξὺ τούτων βασιλέων, *the following kings*, where it is obviously used for μετέπειτα, *post*. So, he adds, Erasmus, Capellus, and L. de Dieu take it. Lightfoot, (ad Matt. iv. 23), understands it of the second and fifth days of the week, upon which synagogues were held, and so far confirms the marginal reading, "in the week between, or in the Sabbath between." If this is to be admitted, meetings must have gone on both in the following week, and on the following Sabbath. (Τὰ ἔθνη, in verse 42, has been obelized, but as it may refer to the body of proselytes, it seems scarcely worth while to disturb it.)

Page 50, *line* 22. 'But why was the Sabbath selected,' &c. Baxter says, in answer to an objector, "Appendix to Divine Appointment," &c. p. 199, "None of the texts cited by you, (viz. from Acts), do prove that the Apostles kept the Sabbath at all as a Sabbath, that is, as a day on which it was their duty to rest; but only that they preached on that day in the synagogues and to the people. For, when should they preach to them but when they were congregated and capable of hearing? They took it for no sin to preach on the Sabbath no more than I should do to preach Christ on Friday, which is their Sabbath, to the Turks, if they would hear me. But Sabbatizing, according to the law, was something else than preaching."

Morer, in his Dialogue called Ἡμέρα Κυριακή, p. 194, quotes, much to the purpose, Chrysostom's comment on St. Paul's "hasting, if it were possible, to be at Jerusalem by the Day of Pentecost," (Acts xx. 16). "What means this haste? did he lie under any obligation to keep that festival, that he showed so much zeal

and earnestness to get timely to Jerusalem? No, it was not so much because of the feast, as because of the multitudes of people resorting thither, and for their sakes he hasted, that he might be able to preach the word to them."—*Chrys.* Hom. xliii. *on Acts.*

Page 52, *line* 5. 'They will, I think, be proved to demonstration,' &c. Dean Hook, (Ch. Dicty, article Lord's Day), quotes for his purpose what Dr. Waterland said when speaking of the doctrine of the Trinity: "If what appears *probably* to be taught in Scripture, appears *certainly* to have been taught in the primitive and Catholic Church, such probability, so strengthened, carries with it the force of demonstration."

Page 53, *line* 19. 'Whatever of this sort afterwards formally belonged to it,' &c. Compare Paley, "Mor. Ph." B. V. c. 7. "The *assembling* upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction, is a law of Christianity of Divine appointment; the *resting* on that day from our employments longer than we are detained from them by attendance on these assemblies, is to Christians an ordinance of human institution: binding nevertheless upon the conscience of every individual of a country in which a weekly Sabbath is established, for the sake of the beneficial purposes which the public and regular observance of it promotes, and recommended perhaps in some degree to the Divine approbation, by the resemblance which it bears to what God has pleased to make a solemn part of the law which He delivered to the people of Israel, and by its subserviency to many of the same uses."

Page 54, *line* 7. 'The first writer,' &c. I do not quote, in argument, the well-known passage in Clemens Rom., 1st Ep. to Cor. § 40, tom. i. p. 170, Coteler. fol. Amst. 1724, where he is speaking of religious services, and says:—Πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν ὅσα ὁ Δεσπότης ἐπιτελεῖν ἐκέλευσεν. Κατὰ καιροὺς τεταγμένους τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, καὶ οὐκ εἰκῇ ἢ ἀτάκτως ἐκέλευσεν γίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὡρισμένοις καιροῖς καὶ ὥραις. Ποῦ τε καὶ διὰ τίνων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι θέλει, αὐτὸς ὥρισεν τῇ ὑπερτάτῃ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει· ἵν' ὁσίως πάντα γινόμενα ἐν εὐδοκήσει εὐπρόσδεκτα εἴη τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ. Οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν, εὐπρόσδεκτοί τε καὶ μακάριοι· τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τοῦ Δεσπότου ἀκολουθοῦντες οὐ διαμαρτάνουσιν. I think it indeed very probable that he alludes here to the Lord's Day: and this seems to be the

opinion of the learned Bishop Fell, who comments thus :—"Re verâ septimum diem humano generi a condito mundo, maximis, hoc est, suis auspiciis sanctum voluit Deus. Unde, postquam in ejusdem *παλιγγενεσίᾳ* novam reparati orbis Epocham instituisset, paribus eam privilegiis et quasi infulis donavit, et *τῆς κυριακῆς* sacrosancta facta est religio." If Clement is speaking of the Lord's Day, he seems to attribute its institution to our Lord Himself; though His appointment of it, mediately, that is, by His Apostles, may be covered by his expression. But as he does not in so many words mention the Lord's Day, I have forborne to quote him in the text. Of the Apostolical Constitutions, falsely so called, and as falsely attributed to Clement, I shall speak bye and bye.

Page 54, *line* 7, 'Ignatius.' The passage from Ignatius is from the Epistle to the Magnesians, the shorter recension. This document is not allowed by Dr. Cureton; but as his palmary argument against it seems to be the fact of its not being contained in a certain imperfect volume, I have thought it better, with Professor Hussey, to await further discoveries and stronger reasons for disallowing it. It is as follows :—

Μὴ πλανᾶσθε ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις, μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφελέσιν οὖσιν· εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ νόμον Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι· οἱ γὰρ θειότατοι προφῆται κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔζησαν· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐδιώχθησαν, ἐμπνεόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας, ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀΐδιος, οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών, ὃς κατὰ πάντα εὐηρέστησεν τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν.

Εἰ οὖν οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλυθον, μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν [ζωὴν] ζῶντες, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ὃν τινες ἀρνοῦνται, . . . πῶς ἡμεῖς δυνησόμεθα ζῆσαι χωρὶς αὐτοῦ; οὗ καὶ οἱ προφῆται μαθηταὶ ὄντες τῷ πνεύματι ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν προσεδόκουν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὃν δικαίως ἀνέμενον, παρὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν.—Ignat. ad Magnes. capp. 8, 9; *Coteler.* tom. ii. pp. 19, 20, fol. Amst. 1724.

Page 55, *line* 7. 'St. Barnabas,' &c.

Πέρας γέ τοι λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τὰς νεομηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ σάββατα ὑμῶν οὐκ ἀνέχομαι. Ὁρᾶτε, πῶς λέγει· οὐ τὰ νῦν σάββατα ἐμοὶ δεκτά· ἀλλ' ἃ πεποίηκα, ἐν ᾧ καταπαύσας τὰ πάντα, ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας

ὀγδόης ποιήσω, ὅ ἐστιν ἄλλου κόσμου ἀρχήν. Διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς.—*S. Barnabæ Epist.* § 15; *Coteler.* tom. i. p. 47.

The concluding words of this passage, or a translation of them, may have been before Mr. J. J. Gurney, (Brief Remarks on the History, &c. of the Sabbath), when he spoke, (p. 69 of his work), of the Ascension Day being on Sunday. A denial of our Lord's Forty Days on earth after the Resurrection has been found in it by others. But, with Neander, I think we cannot necessarily infer from it either that St. Barnabas thought the Ascension occurred on Sunday, or what some have supposed, that he imagined that Christ ascended immediately after manifesting himself to Mary Magdalene. (See Neander, p. 408, vol. i. note.—Bohn's Edition.)

Schram's comment is much to the purpose:—"In illis verbis, *καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς*, auctor videtur dicere, Christum die Dominicâ in cœlum ascendisse, quod falsum est: verum Menardus bene ita hæc interpretatur: cum apparuisset, per quadraginta dies videlicet, postea ascendit ad cœlos: quasi hæc dicta sint obiter extrà suum locum, ut non necesse sit referri ad diem octavum."—Schram, *Analys. Pat.* vol. i. p. 14.

Page 55, line 23. 'Pliny.' Compare with Pliny, Tertullian's Apol. c. 2, where Pliny's letter and Trajan's rescript are eloquently criticised.

Böhmer labours to prove the *stated day* of the Christians to be the Jewish Sabbath. "De Stato Christian. Die," S. 3, et seq., quoted by Holden, p. 293, note. Gesner, in his note to Pliny, agrees with him.

C. C. L. Franke supposes Pliny to have known so little about the matter as to have used a phrase which may cover either the Sabbath or the Lord's Day. "De Diei Dominici apud Veteres Christianos celebratione," p. 29, Halle, 1826.

Mosheim, Bingham, and Augusti, without hesitation consider the *stated day* to be the Lord's Day.

The passage is as follows:—

"Affirmabant autem, hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem: seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latro-

cinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent: quibus peractis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium."—*Plin.* lib. x. epist. 97.

Page 56, *line* 6. 'Justin Martyr.'

Καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγρους μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται . . . .

τὴν δέ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας, κόσμον ἐποίησε, καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς Κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν, καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν Κρονικὴν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡλίου ἡμέρα, φανεὶς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν.—*Justin. Martyr, Apol. Prima.* pp. 97, 98, Lond. 1722.

Page 56, *line* 22. 'In another passage,' &c.

Ἡ δὲ ἐντολὴ τῆς περιτομῆς, κελεύουσα τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ παντὸς περιτέμνειν τὰ γεννώμενα, τύπος ἦν τῆς ἀληθινῆς περιτομῆς ἣν περιετμήθημεν ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης καὶ πονηρίας διὰ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέρᾳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. μία γὰρ τῶν σαββάτων, πρώτη μένουσα τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν, κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν πάλιν τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς κυκλοφορίας ὀγδόη καλεῖται, καὶ πρώτη οὖσα μένει.—*Dial. cum Tryph.* § 41, p. 138 A.

Page 56, *line* ult. 'As for σαββατίζειν, he constantly,' &c.

Καὶ σαββατίζειν οὖν ὑμῖν προστέταχεν, ἵνα μνήμην λαμβάνητε τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ γὰρ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ τοῦτο σημαίνει λέγων, "τοῦ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Θεὸς ὁ λυτρωσάμενος ὑμᾶς."—Ezech. xx. 12, 20. *Dial. cum Tryph.* § 19, p. 119 C.

Μηδὲ ὅτι θερμὸν πίνομεν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι, δεινὸν ἡγεῖσθε.—*Dial. cum Tryph.* § 29, p. 127 B.

Page 57, *line* 6. 'He asserts,' &c.

Καὶ γὰρ μὴ σαββατίσαντες οἱ προωνομασμένοι πάντες δίκαιοι τῷ Θεῷ εὐηρέστησαν, καὶ μετ' αὐτοὺς Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ οἱ τούτου υἱοὶ ἅπαντες μέχρι Μωϋσέως . . . . .—*Dial. cum Tryph.* § 19, p. 119 B.

Ἢ καὶ τοὺς πρὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ὠνομασμένους δικαίους καὶ εὐαρέστους αὐτῷ γενομένους, μήτε τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν περιτετμημένους, μήτε τὰ σάββατα φυλάξαντας, διὰ τί οὐκ ἐδίδασκε ταῦτα ποιεῖν;—*Dial. cum Tryph.* § 27, p. 126 A.

• *Dial. cum Tryph.* § 12, p. 113 A. σεσαββάτικε τὰ τρυφερὰ καὶ ἀληθινὰ σάββατα τοῦ Θεοῦ. The allusion is to Isaiah, c. lviii.

13, καλέσεις τὰ σάββατα τρυφερά.—LXX. Compare a similar adaptation of the Scripture phrase by Macarius, quoted in Lecture III. p. 93.

Page 57, *line* antep. 'Dion Cassius.' From Dion Cassius we learn the fact given in the text that the hebdomadal division of time had become prevalent; "but (he adds) it is not long, so to say, since it began." *Histor.* xxxvii. 18. He then proceeds to explain the reasons why the days were named respectively from the Sun, Moon, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, and Saturn. He says that Egyptians named them thus, and that the cycle itself came from them. Compare Dr. Whewell's "Elements of Morality," &c. B. IV. c. 16. But see Lecture IV. pp. 139—142. On the whole subject consult Selden, "De Jure Naturali et Gentium;" Greswell's "Fasti Temporis Catholici;" and a learned paper by Archdeacon Hare, "On the Names of the Days of the Week," in the first volume of the *Philological Museum.*

Page 58, *line* 14. 'Dionysius.' Valesius, whose version Dr. Routh adopts, translates the passage thus: "Hodie sacrum diem Dominicum transegimus." I am not quite satisfied with this rendering, but cannot suggest any other, except on the supposition that the sentence has lost its apodosis.—*Rel. Sacræ*, vol. i. p. 180, from *Euseb. H. E.* iv. 23.

Page 58, *line* 21. 'Melito.'

Τούτων (Melitonis et Apollinaris) εἰς ἡμετέραν γνῶσιν ἀφῖκται τὰ ὑποτεταγμένα Μελίτωνος, τὰ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα δύο, καὶ τὰ περὶ πολιτείας καὶ προφητῶν, καὶ ὁ περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ὁ περὶ Κυριακῆς λόγος—κ.τ.λ.—*Routh*, "*Reliq. Sacræ*," vol. i. p. 120, from *Euseb. H. E.* iv. 26.

Page 58, *line* 25. 'Irenæus.' After speaking of the symbolical character of circumcision, he proceeds:—

"Hoc idem de Sabbatis Ezechiel propheta ait: *Et Sabbata mea dedi eis, ut sint in signo inter me et ipsos, ut sciant quoniam ego Dominus, qui sanctifico eos.* Et in Exodo Deus ait ad Moysem: *Et Sabbata mea observabitis; erit enim signum apud me vobis in generationes vestras.* In signo ergo data sunt hæc: non autem sine symbolo erant signa, id est, sine argumento, neque otiosa, tanquam quæ a sapiente artifice darentur; sed secundum carnem circumcisio circumcisionem significabat spiritalem. Etenim *nos*, ait Apostolus, *circumcisi sumus circumcisione non manufactâ.* Et Propheta ait, *Circumcidite duritiam cordis vestri.*

Sabbata autem perseverantiam totius diei erga Deum deservitionis edocebant. *Æstimati enim sumus*, ait Apostolus Paulus, *totâ die ut oves occisionis*, scilicet consecrati, et ministrantes omni tempore fidei nostræ, et perseverantes ei, et abstinentes ab omni avaritiâ, non acquirentes, nec possidentes thesauros in terrâ. Manifestabatur autem et tanquam de iis quæ facta sunt, requietio Dei, hoc est, regnum, in quo requiescens homo ille qui perseveraverit Deo adsistere, participabit de mensâ Dei.

"Et quia non per hoc justificabatur homo, sed in signo data sunt populo, ostendit, quod ipse Abraham sine circumcisione et sine observatione sabbatorum, *credidit Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et amicus Dei vocatus est.*"—*Iren. Contr. Hær.* iv. 16, p. 246, ed. Ben. fol. Par. 1710.

Page 59, *line* 14. 'Fragments.'

Καθώς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Εἰρηναῖος ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα λόγῳ, ἐν ᾧ μέμνηται καὶ περὶ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, ἐν ᾗ οὐ κλίνομεν γόνυ, ἐπειδὴ ἰσοδυναμεῖ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Κυριακῆς, κατὰ τὴν ῥηθεῖσαν περὶ αὐτῆς αἰτίαν.—*Fragmentum lib. de Pascha, apud Justin M. Resp. ad Quæst.* 115 *ad Orthod.* p. 490 B., fol. Par. 1742.

Page 59, *line* 21. 'Of Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia.' Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. V. 23, says of *Asia*. But, as Bp. Kaye observes, Asia Minor must be intended, for the orthodox list, (Palestine, Rome, Pontus, Gaul, Osdroene, Corinth, Alexandria,) has certain Asiatic Churches in it.

Page 59, *line* penult. ὡς ἂν μηδ' κ.τ.λ. This passage is not *totidem verbis* attributed by Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. V. 23, to the Churches of Gaul; but we are told there by the historian that it was in substance the ὅρος, or determination of the orthodox Churches generally of that day. A little further on, he informs us that an epistle on the subject from the παροικίαι of Gaul, of which Irenæus was bishop, was extant in his day, (φέρεται δ' εἰσέτι νῦν . . . . γραφὴ . . . . . τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικιῶν, ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει); and in V. 24, he says, that Irenæus, acting as the representative of the brethren in Gaul, of whom he was the ἡγούμενος, wrote to the same effect, (ἐκ προσώπου ὧν ἡγεῖτο κατὰ τὴν Γαλλίαν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιστείλας, παρίσταται τὸ δεῖν ἐν μόνῃ τῇ τῆς Κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ τὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναστάσεως ἐπιτελεῖσθαι μυστήριον.) See Lecture III. p. 90, and compare Thorndike, "Laws of the Church," III. xxi. 22.

Page 60, *line* 10. 'Clement of Alexandria.' In Strom. V.

Clement imagines that he discovers an allusion to the Lord's Day, under the title of the Eighth Day, in the Republic of Plato, B. X. Τὴν δὲ Κυριακὴν ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ δεκάτῳ τῆς Πολιτείας ὁ Πλάτων διὰ τούτων καταμαντεύεται. (Plato's words are, Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῖς ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι ἑκάστοις ἑπτὰ ἡμέραι γένοιντο, ἀναστάντας ἐντεῦθεν δεῖν τῇ ὁγδόῃ πορεύεσθαι, καὶ ἀφικνεῖσθαι τεταρταίους.) Of course, this is a mere fancy, but it shows the hold that the Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα had upon Clement's mind. He next proceeds to produce passages from Greek writers to show that the seventh day was by them considered holy. All that can fairly be collected from these passages is, that the Greeks attached some particular sanctity to the seventh day of the month, and some peculiar virtue to the number seven; but this they did also to other days and numbers. But see Lecture IV. p. 140.

Page 60, *line* 14. 'δι ἀποχῆς.' This is Sylburgius' reading for ἀποδοχῆς, κακῶν. κ.τ.λ. Clem. Alex. Strom. IV. §. 3, p. 566, ed. Potter, fol. Oxon. 1715. See Bp. Kaye's Clement of Alex. p. 416.

Page 60, *line* 16. ἡ ἑβδομὴ τοίνυν. κ.τ.λ. Clem. Alex. Strom. VI. § 16, p. 810.

Page 60, *line* 22. 'Clement takes occasion,' &c. ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὢν, εἰ παύσεταί ποτε ἀγαθοεργῶν, καὶ τοῦ Θεὸς εἶναι παύσεται. Strom. VI. § 16, p. 813. But see Bp. Kaye's Clem. Alex. p. 418, where his paraphrase of the passage about the true Gnostic occurs. False Gnostics are represented as calling themselves κύριοι σαββάτου, and as perversely interpreting our Lord's words to denote freedom from all restraint.—Strom. III. § 4. p. 525.

Page 60, *line* 27. 'As for Christian days,' &c. *Bp. Kaye's Clem. Alex.* p. 451.

Page 61, *line* 6. οὗτος, κ.τ.λ. Clem. Alex. Strom. VII. § 12, p. 877.

Page 61, *line* ult. 'Qui contendit,' &c. Tertull. adv. Judæos, c. 2.

Page 62, *line* 18. 'Diem solis,' &c. The passage in full is, "Æque ac si diem solis lætitiæ indulgemus, aliâ longè ratione ac religione Solis; secundo loco ab eis sumus, qui diem Saturni otio et victui decernunt, exorbitantes et ipsi ab Judaico more quem ignorant."—Tertull. Apoll. c. 16.

Page 62, *line* 26. 'Nobis quibus,' &c. Tertull. de Idolol. c. 14.

Page 63, *line* 4. 'Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel

de geniculis adorare. Eâdem immunitate a die Pascha in Pentecosten usque gaudemus.' Tertull. de Cor. Mil. c. 3.

Page 63, *line* 9. 'Nos vero,' &c. The passage from which it is taken is in Tertullian de Orat. c. 23, Semler's edit. vol. iv. p. 22.

"De genu quoque ponendo varietatem observationis patitur oratio per pauculos quosdam, qui Sabbato abstinent genibus. Quæ dissensio quum maximè apud Ecclesias causam dicat, Dominus dabit gratiam suam, ut aut cedant, aut sine aliorum scandalo sententiâ suâ utantur. Nos verò sicut accepimus, solo die Dominico Resurrectionis non ab isto tantum, sed omni anxietatis * habitu et officio cavere debemus, differentes etiam negotia, ne quem diabolo locum demus. Tantundem et spatio Pentecostes, quæ eadem exultationis solemnitas est,† dispungimus. Cæterum omni die quis dubitet prosternere se Deo vel primâ saltem oratione, quâ lucem ingredimur? Jejuniis autem et stationibus nulla oratio sine genu, et reliquo humilitatis more, celebranda est. Non enim oramus tantum, sed et deprecamur, et satisfacimus Deo Domino nostro. De temporibus orationis nihil omnino præscriptum est, nisi planè omni in tempore et loco orare."

Tertullian has a curious passage in "De Fugâ in Persecutione," c. 14, in which he speaks of celebrating "Dominica Solennia." I believe, from the contiguity of the word "colligemus," which reminds one of the Christian συλλογαὶ, or συνάξεις, that he refers to the Lord's Day. If he refers to the Lord's Supper, he at any rate shows no hesitation about celebrating it at any time. "Sed quomodo *colligemus*, inquis, quomodo *Dominica Solennia celebrabimus?* utique quomodo et Apostoli; fide, non pecuniâ tuti: quæ fides si montem transferre potest, multo magis militem .... Postremo si colligere interdiu non potes, habes noctem, luce Christi luminosâ adversus eam. Non potes discurrere per singulos, sit tibi et in tribus ecclesia."

There is a good note in Semler's edition on the word *colligere*.

Cyprian, "De Op. et Eleem." § 15, has a similar phrase. "Locuples es et dives, et *Dominicum celebrare* te credis, quæ *Corbanam*

* After *habitu* is sometimes inserted *abstinemus*, and for *officio* is read *officia;* but with the reading *officio, abstinemus* is unnecessary.

† *Solennitas est.* Muratori's conjecture for *solennitatem.* He also conjectures *dispungimus* for *dispungimur.*

omnino non respicis? Quæ in Dominicum sine sacrificio venis, quæ partem de sacrificio, quod pauper obtulit, sumis?" Here the words *Corbanam* and *Sacrificium* show clearly that the Lord's Supper, not the Lord's Day, was intended. In fact, Cyprian uses *Dominicum celebrare* in that sense in Epist. ad Cæcil. § 16.

In a work called "The Sabbath, by a Layman," (Sir W. Domville), vol. i. pp. 257 seq., there is a very curious discussion of a misquotation by Bp. Andrewes, (Judgment on Traske,) from "The Acts of the Martyrs," of the phrase *Dominicum servâsti?* Dr. Heurtley, in his University sermon on "The Lord's Day," Oxf. 1856, seems to have believed unsuspectingly, on Bp. Andrewes' authority, that the phrase existed, and that it applied to the Lord's Day.

As to the title given to the day at this period, Bp. Kaye writes thus, (Tertullian, p. 408), "Tertullian uses both names; *that of Sunday*, when addressing the heathens, Apol. c. 16. Ad Nationes, Lib. I. c. 13: *that of the Lord's Day*, when writing to Christians. De Coronâ, c. 3. De Jejuniis, c. 15. De Idololatriâ, c. 14. De Animâ, c. 9. De Fugâ in Persecutione, c. 14. We are not, however, certain that Tertullian uniformly observes this distinction; Bingham thinks that he does, B. XX. c. 2, § 1."

Page 63, *line* 14. 'Canon Robertson.' "History of the Church," vol. i. p. 458.

Page 63, *line* 17. 'Neander.' "Church History," vol. i. p. 408. Bohn's edit.

Page 64, *line* 5. 'Quod si,' &c. "Origen, Comm. in Exod." tom. ii. p. 154 A. After the words in the text occur the following:—"Jam tunc indicatum quod in sabbato ipsorum, gratia Dei ad eos de cœlo nulla descenderit, panis cœlestis qui est sermo Dei ad eos nullus venerit. . . . . In nostrâ enim dominicâ die semper Dominus pluit manna de cœlo."

Page 64, *line* 9. 'It is one of the marks,' &c. Origen speaks very much after the manner of Tertullian. He argues, first, against Jewish days, and times, and years, and then meets the objection: *ἐὰν δέ τις πρὸς ταῦτα ἀνθυποφέρῃ τὰ περὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν κυριακῶν, ἢ παρασκευῶν, ἢ τοῦ πάσχα, ἢ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς δι' ἡμερῶν γινόμενα· λεκτέον καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο, ὅτι ὁ μὲν τέλειος, ἀεὶ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ὢν καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ τοῖς διανοήμασι τοῦ τῇ φύσει Κυρίου Λόγου Θεοῦ, ἀεί ἐστιν αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, καὶ ἀεὶ ἄγει κυριακὰς ἡμέρας.*— Origen, *Contr. Cels.* viii. § 22, tom. i. p. 758 F. Then he goes

on to say that the τέλειος, in like manner, is always keeping Paraseeue, always, as passing over from the affairs of this life to God, keeping Passover; and in like manner also, always keeping a Pentecostal season.

Page 64, *line* 11. 'As for the Sabbath,' &c.

Ὡς γὰρ Κύριός ἐστι τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ οὐ δοῦλος τοῦ σαββάτου ὡς ὁ λαὸς, οὕτως Κύριός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν νόμον διδοὺς, διδόναι μὲν ἄχρι χρόνου διορθώσεως, καὶ ἀλλάσσειν νόμον· ἐπιστάντος δὲ τοῦ χρόνου τῆς διορθώσεως, καὶ διδόναι μετὰ τὴν προτέραν ὁδὸν καὶ μετὰ τὴν προτέραν καρδίαν, ὁδὸν ἑτέραν καὶ καρδίαν ἑτέραν καιρῷ δεκτῷ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας.—Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* tom. iii. p. 643 E.

Ἐγεννήθη ὁ Ἰωάννης ἑτοιμάζων Κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον, ἐπὶ τέλει τῆς παλαιᾶς γενόμενης διαθήκης, ἥ ἐστι σαββατισμοῦ κορωνίς· (extremitas). διʼ ὃ οὐ δύναται γεγενῆσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἑβδομάδος τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν τὴν μετὰ τὸ σάββατον ἀνάπαυσιν, τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ ἐμποιοῦντος τοῖς συμμόρφοις τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ γεγενημένοις καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως.—Origen, *Comm. in Joan.* tom. iv. p. 86 C.

Page 64, *line* 15. 'A curious comment.' The passage occurs Contr. Cels. lib. viii. § 23, tom. i. p. 759 D.

Page 64, *line* 20. 'Minucius Felix.' "Et de convivio notum est, passim omnes loquuntur. Id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio. Ad epulas solemni die coeunt, cum omnibus liberis, sororibus, matribus, sexûs omnis homines, et omnis ætatis." Then he goes on to misrepresent the *Epulæ*.—*Octavius*, § 9, p. 99, ed. Gronov. 8vo. Lugd. Bat. 1709.

On this Rigaltius remarks, "Plinius Cæcilius quamvis ethnicus ab omni de convivio calumniâ Christianos liberavit apud Trajanum. Etenim scripsit, morem illis fuisse coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum hunc et innoxium." The true account of the *Epulæ* is given in section 31 of Minucius' dialogue.

Dies solennis is a phrase used by the Fourth Council of Carthage, where it includes Sunday. See note to Lecture III. p. 109.

Page 65, *line* 5. 'Nam quod,' &c. Cyprian. Epist. LIX. p. 98, ed. Ben. fol. Par. 1726. The title of the Epistle runs thus, "Cyprianus et cæteri collegæ qui in concilio lxvi affuerunt, Fido fratri salutem." (This is the third of Cyprian's Councils of Carthage, and is sometimes called Conc. Afric. I.)

Page 65, *line* 22. 'Commodian.' "De Die Dominicâ quid

dicis?" Instruct. adv. Gentium Deos, 985.—*Bibl. Patr. apud Galland.* tom. iii. p. 644.

Page 65, *line* 26. 'Victorinus.' "S. Victorini Martyris de Fabricâ Mundi." Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 148, quoted by Routh, vol. iii. p. 457.

"Hoc quoque die (he is speaking of Friday) ob passionem Domini Jesu Christi aut stationem Deo, aut jejunium facimus. Die septimo requievit ab omnibus operibus suis, et benedixit eum et sanctificavit. Hoc die solemus superponere; idcirco, ut Die Dominico cum gratiarum actione ad panem exeamus. Et parasceue superpositio fiat, ne quid cum Judæis Sabbatum observare videamur, quod ipse Dominus sabbati Christus per prophetas suos *odisse animam suam* dicit (Is. i. 13, 14); quod sabbatum corpore suo resolvit (vid. Eph. ii. 14, 15): prius autem, cum ipse Moysi præciperet, ne circumcisio diem octavum præteriret, quæ die Sabbati plerumque incurrit, sicut in Evangelio scriptum legimus (vid. Joann. vii. 22)."

Some curious matter follows in the original, how Joshua broke the Sabbath at the siege of Jericho, and how Mattathias broke it by killing the Prefect of Antiochus on that day. Victorinus discovers an intimation of the eighth day in the heading of the sixth Psalm. For further allusion to *superpositio*, or *ὑπέρθεσις*, see Lecture II. p. 75. And on the *Dies stationarii*, consult Dr. Routh's notes on this passage, Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, p. 414, and Neander's Church Hist. vol. i. Bohn's edit. p. 409, note. Wednesday and Friday were *Dies stationarii*. A *statio* or *semi-jejunium* concluded at the ninth hour. A *jejunium* lasted till the evening. The word *statio* refers to the notion that on these days of fasting accompanied with prayer, Christians were keeping watch (*stationem*) as soldiers of Christ (*milites Christi*). The word *statio* first occurs in this sense in Hermas, l. iii. Similitud. v. Coteler. tom. i. p. 105, but is often met with in Tertullian. The word *superpositio* appears in the 26th Canon of the Council of Eliberis, A.D. 305:

Page 65, *line* 28. 'Peter of Alexandria.'

Οὐκ ἐγκαλέσει τις ἡμῖν παρατηρουμένοις τετράδα καὶ παρασκευήν, ἐν αἷς καὶ νηστεύειν ἡμῖν κατὰ παράδοσιν εὐλόγως προστέτακται· τὴν μὲν τετράδα, διὰ τὸ γενόμενον συμβούλιον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπὶ τῇ προδοσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου, τὴν δὲ παρασκευήν, διὰ τὸ πεπονθέναι αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. Τὴν γὰρ κυριακὴν, χαρμοσύνης ἡμέραν ἄγομεν, διὰ τὸν ἀνασ-

τάντα ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐν ᾗ οὐδὲ γόνατα κλίνειν παρειλήφαμεν. Sancti Petri, ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὸ πάσχα.—*Bibl. Patr. apud Galland.* tom. iv. p. 107.

Dr. Routh has a note on the question of standing in prayer on the Lord's Day, vol. iv. p. 45.

Page 66, *line* 3. 'We have now gone through,' &c.

Another second century authority has recently been brought to light by Dr. Cureton, (Spicilegium Syriacum, pp. 31, 32,) in the treatise by Bardesanes, the heretic, "on Fate," otherwise called the "Book of the Laws of Countries." The writer, who calls himself a Christian, and no doubt was so in his own estimation, is speaking of the customs of different nations. Of the Jews he says; "All of them, wherever they are, abstain from worshipping idols; and one day in seven they and their children abstain from all work, and from all building, and from all travelling, and from buying and selling; neither do they kill an animal on the Sabbath day, nor kindle fire, nor judge a cause; and there is not found amongst them a man whom Fortune commands that on the Sabbath day he should either go to law and gain his cause, or go to law and lose it, or should pull down or build up, or do any one of those things which all such men as have not received this law do." . . . Then he passes to the Christians: "What, then, shall we say respecting the new race of ourselves who are Christians, whom, in every country, and in every region the Messiah established at His coming? For, lo! wherever we be, all of us are called by the one name of the Messiah—Christians; and upon one day, which is the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together, and on the appointed days we abstain from food."

Bardesanes composed his work about the middle of the second century, probably soon after the conquest of Arabia by the Romans, which took place under Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, for, as Dr. Cureton observes, he speaks of it as a recent conquest. The translation is given in Dr. Cureton's words.

I have not thought it worth while to introduce into the text a curious passage about Alexander Severus, which occurs in Ælius Lampridius, (one of the *Scriptores Histor. August.*, who lived in the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine,) and is thus commented upon and partially quoted by Selden, De Jur. Nat. et Gentium juxta Disc. Ebræor. Lib III. c. 18. (tom i. col.

383. Opp. fol. Lond. 1726.) "Quod vero ex Lampridio affertur de Alexandri Severi ascensu in Capitolium septimo quoque (nam sic intelligendum) die, cum in urbe esset; dubitandum non videtur quin id spectârit ad animum ejus sive in Judaismum sive in Christianismum propensiorem, adeoque ad diei sive Judæorum sive Christianorum hebdomadici singularem cultum. Nam statim sequitur apud Lampridium, *Christo templum facere voluit, eumque inter Deos recipere.* Et ante, *Quodam tempore festo, ut solent, Antiochenses, Ægyptii, Alexandrini lacessiverant cum convitiolis, Syrum archisynagogum eum vocantes et archierea;* velut ritibus Judæis utentem. In diis etiam, id est in lararii sui numinibus, Abrahamum eum ac Christum habuisse scribit idem Lampridius. Ita morem ejus septimo die in Capitolium ascendendi non omnino refert ille perinde ac si ex publico aliquo ac veteri Romanis instituto mos ille manâsset." Thus far Selden. But see Gibbon, c. xvi. vol. ii. pp. 209–210, note.

Page 67, *line* 1. 'The third, that,' &c. This objection is made in so many words by the late Mr. Baden Powell, "Christianity without Judaism," Essay III. § 5, p. 161.

Page 67, *line* 11. 'Compare them with those,' &c. See Lecture VI. pp. 230—231.

Page 68, *line* 5. 'The Sabbath is seldom,' &c. The only places in which the Sabbath is mentioned in the historical books between the Pentateuch and Nehemiah appear to be—2 Kings iv. 23, "It is neither new moon nor Sabbath," in the time of Elisha; 2 Kings xi. 5, 7, 9, and 2 Chron. xxiii. 8, which refer to Athaliah's deposition on that day; 2 Kings xvi. 18, which speaks of the "covert for the Sabbath;" 1 Chron. ix. 32, where the Kohathites are said to be "over the shewbread to prepare it every Sabbath;" 1 Chron. xxiii. 31, a similar passage; 2 Chron. ii. 4 and viii. 13, where it occurs in connexion with Solomon's intention and use of the Temple; and 2 Chron. xxxi. 3, where Hezekiah's reformation restores the Temple to its use. The one remaining place is 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, which records the fulfilment of the prophecy in Leviticus xxvi. 34, 35, 43.

Bishop Beveridge has made a strange use of this unfrequent notice of the Sabbath in the historical parts of the Old Testament. He forgets that it is twice mentioned, as we have shown, in Solomon's time; and supposes the first reappearance of it to be in Elisha's days: this, however, is of minor importance. But he

writes :—"Although there be no mention made of it in all that time between Moses and Elisha, yet, notwithstanding, none ever doubted but that the Sabbath was kept in those days." This is true enough; but it is difficult to follow him as he goes on :—"There is as little reason to doubt but that the patriarchs before Moses kept one day in seven, although we have no records left of it, from whence we can be certain after what manner they kept it, and whether it was the seventh day which the Jews were afterwards commanded to observe, or that which we now keep, as some have thought." He ought to have said, rather, "although we have no records at all of it." In other words, his so-called parallel is, an institution *known to have been published by Moses*, of the observance of which *a few notices* are preserved, and an institution *not known to have been published before Moses*, of the observance of which *no notice whatever* is preserved.—"*Church Catechism Explained.*" *Works*, vol. viii. p. 80, Oxford edition. On the question of the existence of a Patriarchal Sabbath, see Lecture IV.

Page 71, *line* 1. 'Like circles,' &c. Keble, *Christmas Day.*

Page 72, *line* 1. 'And they speak variously of the Lord's Day,' &c. See Lecture V. p. 208.

Page 72, *line* 8. 'They are not critics,' &c. As for instance, we cannot agree with Chrysostom, Irenæus, and Tertullian, when they derive πάσχα from πάσχω, or *patior*, on account of Christ's having suffered at the time of this feast. It is impossible also to follow them, especially those of the Alexandrine School, in many of their mystical interpretations of Scripture, their discovery of the implication of great truths in certain numbers, and the like. "The number of persons saved in the Ark, (says Justin Martyr, in his Apology), was a symbol of the Day on which Christ rose from the dead, being the Eighth in number, but the First in power;" this will strike most readers as utterly fanciful.

Page 72, *line* 29. 'That recognized buildings,' &c. Dean Milman, speaking of the reign of Alexander Severus, A. D. 222—235, to whose time Tillemont assigns the date of the earliest Christian edifices for Christian worship, writes thus :—

"Christian bishops were admitted, even at the Court, in a recognised official character: and Christian Churches began to rise in different parts of the Empire, and to possess endowments in land. To the astonishment of the heathen, their religion had

as yet appeared without temple or altar; their religious assemblies had been held in privacy: it was yet a domestic worship. Even the Jew had his public synagogue or his more secluded proseucha; but where the Christians met was indicated by no separate and distinguished dwelling; the cemetery of their dead, the sequestered grove, the private chamber, contained their peaceful assemblies," &c.—*History of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 232.

The heathen reproached the Christians, (see Minucius Felix,) with being a 'latebrosa et lucifuga natio,' probably in consequence of their meeting in cemeteries. Even these places are forbidden to them in some imperial edicts which prosecute the followers of "the new superstition." See Northcote's *Roman Catacombs*, p. 22.

Gibbon observes that Mr. Moyle refers the first construction of Christian Churches to the reign of Gallienus, A.D. 253—268. *Decline and Fall*, &c. c. xvi. vol. ii. p. 208, note. Lond. 1828.

Page 73, *line* 15. 'Hooker.' Eccl. Pol. iv. 11. 10.

Page 73, *line* 26. 'Bishop Stillingfleet.' Orig. Sac. II. 1 (p. 105, 8vo. Oxf. 1817).

Page 74, *line* 5. 'The Jewish ceremonies,' &c. Morer, Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα, p. 197, quotes Augustine for this, on the authority of Cornelius à Lapide.

Page 74, *line* 8. 'The Nazarenes,' &c. Justin Martyr very well distinguishes between the Nazarenes and the Ebionites.

Εἰσὶν, ἀπεκρινάμην, ὦ Τρύφων, καὶ μηδὲ κοινωνεῖν ὁμιλίας ἢ ἑστίας τοῖς τοιούτοις τολμῶντες· οἷς ἐγὼ οὐ σύναινός εἰμι, ἀλλ' ἐὰν αὐτοὶ, διὰ τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῆς γνώμης, καὶ τὰ ὅσα δύνανται νῦν ἐκ τῶν Μωσέως ἃ διὰ τὸ σκληροκάρδιον τοῦ λαοῦ νοοῦμεν διατετάχθαι, μετὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν Χριστὸν ἐλπίζειν, καὶ τὰς αἰωνίους καὶ φύσει δικαιοπραξίας καὶ εὐσεβείας φυλάττειν βούλωνται, καὶ αἱρῶνται συζῆν τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς καὶ πιστοῖς, ὡς προεῖπον, μὴ πείθοντες αὐτοὺς μήτε περιτέμνεσθαι ὁμοίως αὐτοῖς, μήτε σαββατίζειν, μήτε ἄλλα ὅσα τοιαῦτά ἐστι τηρεῖν, καὶ προσλαμβάνεσθαι, καὶ κοινωνεῖν ἁπάντων, ὡς ὁμοσπλάγχνοις καὶ ἀδελφοῖς, δεῖν ἀποφαίνεσθαι. Ἐάν δὲ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ὑμετέρου πιστεύειν λέγοντες ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν Χριστὸν, ὦ Τρύφων, ἔλεγον, ἐκ παντὸς κατὰ τὸν διὰ Μωσέως διαταχθέντα νόμον ἀναγκάζωσι ζῆν τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν Χριστὸν, ἢ μὴ κοινωνεῖν αὐτοῖς τῆς τοιαύτης συνδιαγωγῆς αἱρῶνται, ὁμοίως καὶ τούτους οὐκ ἀποδέχομαι· τοὺς δὲ πειθομένους αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὴν ἔννομον πολιτείαν, μετὰ τοῦ φυλάττειν τὴν εἰς τὸν

Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁμολογίαν, καὶ σωθήσεσθαι ἴσως ὑπολαμβάνω. *Dial. cum Tryph.* § 47, p. 143 A.

Justin's censure of the Ebionites is more gentle than that which was uttered afterwards, when the Church was obliged to declare them to be in formal heresy. But he is quite clear as to the mistaken character of their views.

The Nazarenes were often confounded with the Ebionites, who held many dangerous errors. Irenæus classes them together. Origen, (as Justin Martyr), distinguishes them, or at any rate so subdivides the Ebionites, as to show that one class of them held the views properly attributable to the Nazarenes. The Ebionites proper denied the miraculous birth of Christ. These he considers to be heretics against St. Paul, and to differ very little from Jews. Τύπτουσι τὸν Ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγοις δυσφήμοις, *In Jerem. Homil.* xviii. c. 12. tom. iii. p. 254 E. Ὀλίγῳ διαφέροντες τῶν Ἰουδαίων, *In Matth.* t. xi. § 12. tom. iii. p. 494 D. The others, who were properly Nazarenes, admitted the miraculous birth of Christ.

Page 74, *line* 23. 'It is one argument,' &c.

The passage alluded to in the larger edition of Ignatius is as follows:—

Ἕκαστος ὑμῶν σαββατιζέτω πνευματικῶς, μελέτῃ νόμου χαίρων, οὐ σώματος ἀνέσει, δημιουργίαν Θεοῦ θαυμάζων, οὐκ ἔωλα ἐσθίων, καὶ χλιαρὰ πίνων, καὶ μεμετρημένα βαδίζων, καὶ ὀρχήσει καὶ κρότοις νοῦν οὐκ ἔχουσι χαίρων· καὶ μετὰ τὸ σαββατίσαι, ἑορταζέτω πᾶς φιλόχριστος τὴν κυριακὴν, τὴν ἀναστάσιμον, τὴν βασιλίδα, τὴν ὕπατον πασῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν.—Pseud. Ignat. ad Magn. § 9. Coteler. tom. ii. p. 57.

Great confusion has been caused by this version of the Epistle being supposed to be genuine. The most absurd statements have been founded upon it, and many of our own writers have been led away by it. A very careful examination of the subject has resulted in the statements made in the text of this Lecture, that if the Sabbath was observed at all by Christians during the first three centuries, it was observed in one of the following ways:—1. as the Apostles observed it, compassionately and charitably, and in order to meet the Jews upon it, but not as of obligation; 2. as the Nazarenes observed it—as a remnant of Judaism which, as Jews, they could not divest themselves of, and were just allowed in by the forbearance of the Church, but

not commended for retaining; 3. as the Ebionites observed it—as a mixture of Judaism with Christianity, which they were considered heretics for enforcing upon all as necessary to salvation; 4. as a Christian, not as a Jewish day—*i. e.* as a mere name for the day succeeding Friday and preceding Sunday. There was, and there could have been, no date in the ante-Nicene period, when the Christian Church observed two-sevenths of time, a Jewish Sabbath and a Christian Sunday. Hence, as I observe in Lecture III. pp. 102, 103, as well as in this Lecture, the Apostolical Constitutions, which echo and even develop the statements in the pseudo-Ignatian document, must be assigned to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century. For the manner in which the Eastern Church eventually treated the Sabbath I must refer the reader to that Lecture, and to the notes upon the pages of it here quoted. It may be observed in passing that the phrase *μετὰ τὸ σαββατίσαι* has caused those who have attempted to translate it no small trouble. Cawdrey, for instance, (Sabb. Rediv. vol. ii. p. 573), puzzled by finding that it apparently makes the Christian institution inferior to the Jewish, renders it "setting aside the Sabbath."

Page 76, *line* 15. 'St. Peter fasted,' &c. Conf. Augustin. Epist. 36, ad Casulanum, (cap. ix. tom. ii. col. 101, 4to. Bass. 1797–1807.) "Est quidem et hæc opinio plurimorum, quamvis eam esse falsam perhibeant plerique Romani, quod Apostolus Petrus, cum Simone Mago die Dominico certaturus, propter ipsum magnæ tentationis periculum, pridie cum ejusdem urbis ecclesiâ jejunaverit et consecuto tam prospero gloriosoque successu, eundem morem tenuerit, eumque imitatæ sint nonnullæ Occidentis ecclesiæ."

LECTURE III.

Page 77, *line* 10. 'Omnes judices,' &c. Cod. Justin, iii. tit. 12, l. 3.

Page 78, *line* 8. 'Daniel Cawdrey' (ut suprà). Part IV. c. ii. p. 568. (His coadjutor in the first part, Herbert Palmer, had died before the last three parts were published.) He is obviously answering Dr. Heylin.

Page 80, *line* 13. 'It is worth noticing, too,' &c. See Bp. Kaye, "Account of the Early Church," pp. 132, 133. Euseb. "De Vitâ Constantin." i. 12, and Proem to his "Oratio de Laudib. Constantin."

Page 80, *line* penult. 'Edict of an unquestionably heathen character.' To please the adherents of the old religion, Constantine decreed by an edict of the same year that the auspices should be regularly consulted. Cod. Theod. xvi. tit. 10, l. 1. Compare also "Time and Faith," &c. vol. ii. p. 571. London, 1857.

Page 81, *line* 10. 'Nundines.' Gieseler, "Compend. of Eccl. Hist." (Davidson's translation), vol. i. p. 203, observes that even after Constantine's time Nundines as well as Weeks were in use, and continued so until Theodosius the Great made the law respecting the observance of Sunday strict. Cod. Theod. viii. tit. 8, l. 3. He adds that both are found in a Kalendar composed about A.D. 354, (in Grævii Thes. tom. viii. p. 97).

Page 81, *line* 20. 'A still lower view,' &c. "The mind of Constantine might fluctuate between the pagan and Christian religions. According to the loose and complying notions of Polytheism, he might acknowledge the God of the Christians as *one* of the many deities who composed the hierarchy of heaven." —Gibbon, "Decline," &c. c. xx. This view seems more suited to the days of Alexander Severus. But the historian proceeds: "Or perhaps he might embrace the philosophic and pleasing idea, that notwithstanding the variety of names, of rites, and of opinions, all the sects and all the nations of mankind are united in the worship of the common Father and Creator of the universe." This more agrees with Gieseler's account: "Con-

stantine's first religious impressions, like those of his father, were essentially the new platonic. He acknowledged one Supreme God, who had revealed Himself in many ways among men, and honoured Apollo in particular as the revealer of this Being. As this idea of Apollo and the Christian idea of Christ were obviously similar, Constantine may have thought that he found in it very soon a point of union between Christianity and heathenism."—Gieseler, (ut suprà) vol. i. p. 199. He subjoins some curious illustrations of the devotion of the Emperor to Apollo. Tertullian's words are: "Alii planè humanius et verisimilius Solem credunt deum nostrum. . . . . Denique inde suspicio, quod innotuerit nos ad orientis regionem precari. Sed et plerique vestrum, affectatione aliquando et cœlestia adorandi, ad solis ortum labia vibratis. Æquè si diem solis lætitiæ indulgemus, aliâ longè ratione quam religione solis."—*Apol.* c. 16.

Page 83, *line* 4. 'Hooker.' "Eccl. Pol." V. 71. 9.

Page 83, *line* 16. 'Heylin.' "History of the Sabbath," Part II. c. iii. § 12. "Thus do we see upon what grounds the Lord's Day stands: on custom first, and voluntary consecration of it to religious meetings; that custom countenanced by the Church of God, which tacitly approved the same; and finally confirmed and ratified by Christian princes throughout their empires."

Page 84, *line* 9. 'Edict of Milan.' Lactantius, "de Morte Persecutorum," c. 48, has preserved the Latin original of this edict; and Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl." lib. x. c. 5, a translation of it into Greek.

Page 84, *line* 27. 'A day already as we believe regarded.' Compare the two following passages:—

"That the first Christian Emperor, finding all Christians unanimous in the possession of the day, should make a law, (as our kings do,) for the due observing of it; and that the first General Council should establish uniformity in the very gesture of worship on that day, are strong confirmations of the matter of fact, that the Churches unanimously agreed in the holy use of it as a separated day even *from and in the Apostles' days.*"—*Richard Baxter, "The Div. Appt. of Lord's Day,"* p. 41.

"Amongst this long array of sacred seasons, legislative enactment naturally selected for its first objects those regarded

by the Christians with the deepest reverence. Accordingly we find Constantine the Great providing that the Lord's Day, which, probably out of deference to the feelings of the still numerous adherents to the old religion, he calls 'the day of the Sun, so famed for the reverence due to it,' should not be occupied by the 'disputes of the forum, and the injurious contentions of suitors.' And the first law respecting the abstinence from work on days kept holy by the Church relates, like the first law respecting the suspension of judicial proceedings at such seasons, to the Lord's Day."—*E. V. Neale*, "*Feasts and Fasts*," pp. 17, 91.

Page 86, *line* 2. · ἠρέμα, κ.τ.λ. Euseb. "de Vitâ Constantini," iv. 18, p. 635, ed. Reading.

Compare Prince Albert de Broglie, "L'Eglise et l'Empire," vol. i. p. 306, "L'Eglise à ce moment solennel accepta de Dieu et de Constantin la tâche d'émanciper le monde sans le bouleverser."

Page 87, *line* 3. 'Eusèbe affirme,' &c. "De Vitâ Constantin." iv. 18, p. 635. Prince Albert de Broglie, (ut suprà,) vol. i. p. 308, note.

Page 87, *line* 11. 'Sozomen.' "Hist. Eccl." i. 8, pp. 19, 20.

Page 88, *line* 26. 'The Lord's Day had, as a Festival,' &c.

L'Estrange, "Alliance of Divine Offices," p. 85, says, "In the Apostles' time there is no constat of any other Christian Festival observed than the weekly only."

And, even in the third century, Origen only mentions three, the Lord's Day, Easter, and Pentecoste. See also Lardner, "Credibility," &c. vol. iv. p. 214, for a notice of the Festivals of the first three centuries.

Page 90, *line* 4. 'Lactantius.'

"Quoniam perfectis operibus requievit die septimo, eumque benedixit, necesse est ut in fine sexti millesimi anni malitia omnis aboleatur e terrâ, et regnet per annos mille justitia: sitque tranquillitas et requies a laboribus, quos mundus jamdiu perfert."—*Lact. Inst. Div.* lib. vii. cap. 14, tom. i. p. 557, 4to. Par. 1748.

Page 90, *line* 9. 'The Nicene Council.'

'Επειδὴ τινές εἰσιν ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ γόνυ κλίνοντες, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ἡμέραις, ὑπὲρ τοῦ πάντα ἐν πάσῃ παροικίᾳ φυλάττεσθαι, ἑστῶτας ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τὰς εὐχὰς ἀποδιδόναι τῷ Θεῷ.—Can. xx. *Conc. Nicæn. Labbé*, tom. ii. col. 677, fol. Flor. 1759.

Compare Bp. Hacket's remark :—

"The great Council of Nice doth not command the first day of the week to be kept holy, but supposeth, in the twentieth canon, all good Christians would admit that without scruple, and then appoints other significant ceremonies to be kept upon the Lord's Day [and] from Easter to Whitsuntide."—*Century of Sermons: Fourth Sermon on the Resurrection*, p. 583.

Page 90, *line* 18. 'Known even in Irenæus' time.' See note on Lecture II. p. 59.

Page 90, *line* 20. 'That the Apostles had an Easter Festival.' Euseb. "Hist. Eccl." v. 23.

Page 90, *line* 22. 'That Constantine appointed for prayer,' &c. Καὶ ἡμέραν δὲ, κ.τ.λ. quoted already in Lecture III. p. 87.

Page 90, *line* 26. 'In another place.' "De Laudibus Constantin." c. 9.

Page 90, *line* 27. 'Again, he eulogises,' &c.

Τίς τοῖς τὸ μέγα στοιχεῖον τῆς γῆς οἰκοῦσι, τοῖς τε κατὰ γῆν καὶ τοῖς κατὰ θάλατταν, ἐφ' ἑκάστης ἑβδομάδος τὴν κυριακὴν χρηματίζουσαν ἡμέραν, ἑορτὴν ἄγειν ἐπιταυτὸ συνιόντας παραδέδωκε, καὶ αὐτὰ σώματα πιαίνειν· τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἐνθέοις παιδεύμασιν ἀναζωπυρεῖν παρεσκεύασε;—*De Laudibus Constantin.* c. 17.

Page 91, *line* 3. 'It was part,' &c.

Ἑβραιοι δὲ πρεσβύτεροι Μωσέως γενόμενοι τοῖς χρόνοις, πάσης τῆς διὰ Μωσέως νομοθεσίας ἀνεπήκοοι ὄντες, ἐλεύθερον καὶ ἀνειμένον εὐσεβείας κατώρθουν τρόπον.—*Præpar. Evangel.* lib. vii. cap. 6, p. 304 D. fol. Col. 1628.

Page 91, *line* 14. The passage from the "De Sabbatis," &c. of Athanasius is too lengthy to be set down here, but will well repay perusal. One of the phrases translated in the text is very remarkable in the Greek. "The Sabbath was γνῶσις τοῦ Ποιητοῦ, παῦλα δὲ τοῦ σχήματος τῆς κτίσεως ταύτης." And again, because Sabbath means, mystically, rest from sin, days not really Sabbaths are called so in Scripture :—ἀμέλει καὶ τὰς μὴ ἡμέρας τῶν σαββάτων, ὅμως διὰ τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τὴν τῆς θεογνωσίας χάριν, σάββατα ὀνομάζειν εἴωθεν ὁ νόμος. Among other points, John v. 17, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," is alleged as a Divine example against ἀργία on the Sabbath. "God is ever carrying on the work of renovation."

Page 91, *line* penult. 'The sixth Psalm.' Ὑπερ τῆς ὀγδόης. Καὶ τίς ἂν εἴη ἡ ὀγδόη, ἢ ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναστάσιμος ἡμέρα, καθ'

ἦν τῶν ἡμετέρων κόπων ἀπολῃψόμεθα καρπους;—tom. i. p. 2, p. 808.

Page 91, *line* ult. 'The hundred and eighteenth Psalm.'

"Αὕτη ἡμέρα ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος." Καὶ τίς ἂν εἴη, ἢ ἡ ἀναστάσιμος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμέρα; ποία δὲ αὕτη ἡμέρα, ἀλλ' ἡ σωτήριος τῶν ἐθνῶν ἁπάντων, καθ' ἣν ὁ ἀποβληθεὶς λίθος γέγονεν εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας; σημαίνει δὲ ὁ λόγος τὴν ἀναστάσιμον τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, τήν γε ἐπώνυμον αὐτοῦ γενομένην, δηλαδὴ, κυριακήν.—tom. i. p. 957 C.

Page 92, *line* 9. 'In his Encyclical Letter.'

Ἤδειν γὰρ αὐτους ἀφ' ὧν ἔπραξαν εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν ἐκκλησίαν κακῶν, μηδὲν τῶν δεινῶν καὶ κατὰ τῆς ἄλλης παραιτουμένους· ὅπουγε οὐδὲ αὐτὴν τὴν κυριακὴν τῆς ἁγίας ἑορτῆς ᾐδέθησαν. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνθρώπους εἰς φυλακὴν κατεῖρξαν· ὅτε ὁ μὲν Κύριος τοὺς πάντας ἐκ τῶν τοῦ θανάτου δεσμῶν ἠλευθέρωσεν. ὁ δὲ Γρηγόριος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ὥσπερ ἀντιμαχόμενοι τῷ Σωτῆρι, καὶ θαῤῥοῦντες τῇ τοῦ Ἡγεμόνος προστασίᾳ, τὴν ἐλευθέριον ἡμέραν τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλοις πένθος πεποιήκασιν. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἕλληνες ηὐφραίνοντο δυσωπούμενοι τὴν ἡμέραν· ὁ δὲ Γρηγόριος..... πενθεῖν ἠναγκαζε τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς τῇ κακώσει τῶν δεσμῶν.—tom. i. p. 91 C.

Page 93, *line* 3. μετέθηκε δὲ, κ.τ.λ. This is explained by Cocceius, "Testimonia Veterum," p. 49; and by Bp. F. White, (ut suprà,) pp. 77, 78, much as I have explained it in the text.

Page 93, *line* 11. 'Juvencus.' "Evang. Hist." ii. 583, and iv. 728. Migne, Patrol. tom. xix. coll. 195, 339.

Page 93, *line* 14. 'Macarius.' Homil. 35, c. i. ii. iii.—*Apud Galland, Bibl. Patr.* tom. vii. p. 126 A.

Page 93, *line* 25. 'Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem.' "Catech." iv. § 37, p. 70, fol. Par. 1720.

Καὶ μήτε εἰς Σαμαρειτισμὸν, ἢ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἐκπέσῃς· ἐλυτρώσατο γάρ σε λοιπὸν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός. Πάσης Σαββάτων παρατηρήσεως ἀπόστηθι· καὶ τοῦ κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν τι εἶναι τῶν ἀδιαφόρων βρωμάτων.

Page 94, *line* 1. 'Hilary.' In Psalm. xcii. (xci.) tom. i. col. 270, fol. Veron. 1730; and also prolegom. in Psalmos, § 12, tom. i. col. 8. What Hilary says about God working in Nature is borrowed more or less by Herder, quoted in Lecture IV. p. 163.

Page 94, *line* 16. 'Epiphanius.'

Συνάξεις δὲ ἐπιτελούμεναι ταχθεῖσαί εἰσιν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, τετράδι (Wedn.) καὶ προσαββάτῳ (Frid.) καὶ κυριακῇ (Sund.). —*Expos. Fid. Cathol.* c. xxii. tom. i. p. 1104 C, fol. Col. 1682. And in c. xxiv. he adds: ἔν τισι δὲ τόποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς σάββασι (Saturd.), συνάξεις ἐπιτελοῦσιν.

Lardner, "Credibility," &c. vol. iv. p. 218, quotes Petavius to the effect that the Lord's Day is the only day of Apostolical authority for its observance.

"Denique quod Epiphanius monet, 'triplicem illam synaxim dierum totidem ab Apostolis esse traditam:' haud scio an satis constare queat. Nam primis ecclesiæ temporibus unus duntaxat Dominicus dies ad eam rem observatus videtur, ut ex Apostolo 1 ad Cor. cap. xvi. colligitur. Quinetiam Justinus, in Apol. Primâ, cum de Christianorum conventibus agit, solius Dominicæ meminit: τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα. Quare magis id ex privato ecclesiæ cujusque ritu, quam ex communi Apostolorum præscripto derivatum existimo, ut quartâ sextâ ve feriâ, aut etiam Sabbato, synaxes conventus ve fierent. Quam in rem egregius est Augustini locus Ep. cxviii. tom. iii. col. 165. 'Alia verò' inquit, quæ per loca terrarum regionesque variantur, sicuti est, quod alii jejunant Sabbato, alii non: alii quotidie communicant corpori et sanguini dominico, alii certis diebus accipiunt: alibi nullus dies prætermittitur, quo non offeratur, alibi Sabbato tantum et Dominico: alibi tantum Dominico: et si quid aliud hujusmodi animadverti potest, totum hoc genus liberas habet observationes."—*Petav. Animad. in Epiph.* p. 354, fin.

Page 94, *line* 24. 'He is very clear,' &c. As where he speaks of many Sabbaths, great and less.—*Adv. Hær.* xxx. § 32, tom. i. p. 158, 159. 'Jericho'—'Sacrifices in the Temple.'—*Adv. Hær.* lxvi. § 82, p. 702. 'The Sabbath was made for man.' Προετίμησε τὸν ἄνθρωπον παρὰ τὸ σάββατον, ἵνα ὁ ἄνθρωπος γινώσκῃ τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων τὴν ἀνάπαυλαν.—*Adv. Hær.* lxvi. § 85, p. 708 C. 'It was not ordained.'—*Adv. Hær.* lxvi. p. 704 D. And in *Expos. Fid. Cathol.* c. xxii. p. 1105 B. Τὰς κυριακὰς ἁπάσας τρυφερὰς ἡγεῖται ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

Page 95, *line* 7. 'Incidentally,' &c.

Epiphanius says of Marcion:—

Τὸ δὲ σάββατον νηστεύει διὰ τοιαύτην αἰτίαν· ἐπειδή, φησὶ, τοῦ

Θεοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν ἡ ἀνάπαυσις τοῦ πεποιηκότος τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναπαυσαμένου, ἡμεῖς νηστεύσωμεν ταύτην, ἵνα μὴ τὸ καθῆκον τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐργαζώμεθα.—Adv. Hær. xlii. § 3, tom. i. p. 304 B.

Page 95, *line* 15. 'He frequently speaks.'

"Resurrectionis celebritas die Dominicâ celebratur. Dominicâ autem jejunare non possumus, quia Manichæos etiam ob istius diei jejunia jure damnamus."—*Ambros. Epist.* xxiii. § 11, tom. ii. col. 883 C.

Page 95, *line* 20. 'Contrasts the living and evangelical Lord's Day,'—as in *Enarrat. ad Psalm.* xliii. where he says the Lord's Day has the "Prærogativa," tom. i. col. 887 E.

And again:—

"Ubi enim Dominica dies cœpit præcellere quâ Dominus resurrexit, sabbatum quod primum erat, secundum haberi cœpit à primo. Prima enim requies cessavit, secunda successit."—*In Psalm.* xlvii. § 1, tom. i. col. 936 D.

Page 95, *line* 22. 'De Obitu Theodosii,' §. 29, tom. ii. col. 1206 B.

Page 95, *line* 23. 'Occasionally.'

"Die septimo ad sepulcrum redimus, qui dies symbolum futuræ quietis est."—*De Fid. Res.* ii. 2, tom. ii. col. 1135 B.

Page 95, *line* 28. 'Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa.' The passage ending with *διδάσκεται* occurs in his work, "In Christ. Resurr." Orat. i. p. 826, tom. ii. fol. Par. 1615. The word *αἰνιγματωδῶς* is found in it, and may serve as an illustration of its employment by Chrysostom. See Lecture III. p. 105.

Page 96, *line* 5. 'In one place.'

Πυίοις γὰρ ὀφθαλμοῖς τὴν Κυριακὴν ὁρᾷς ὁ ἀτιμάσας τὸ Σάββατον; ἢ οὐκ οἶδας ὡς ἀδελφαὶ αὐταὶ αἱ ἡμέραι; κἂν εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν ἐξυβρίσῃς, τῇ ἑτέρᾳ προσκρούεις; ἔχων νοῦν καὶ λόγον οὐ προορᾷς τὸ πρέπον καὶ συμφέρον· οὐδὲ ἐμμελῶς ποιῇ τῆς σαυτοῦ ἀθανασίας τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν.—Ibid. p. 744.

The comment given in the text on this passage is that of Cocceius. Dr. Thomas Young supposes Gregory to be alluding to neglect of opportunities of public worship which were now given on Saturday as a preparation for Sunday, and which, though not of obligation as those on Sunday, might conveniently and profitably be attended. See Dr. Young in "Dies Dominica." p. 14, and Lecture II. p. 75.

Page 96, *line* 14. 'Gregory of Nazianzus.' For the discussion on the number Seven, see Orat. xli. § 2, tom. i. pp. 732-3, fol. Par. 1778. His works abound in allusions to the Lord's Day. In especial he has a curious passage in his 44th Oration, in which he says thus: *ἡ πρώτη κτίσις*, or the Old Creation, began with the First Day, that is, the Lord's Day; and *ἡ δευτέρα κτίσις*, or the New Creation, began with the Lord's Day. That Day in the New Creation is *πρώτη τῶν μετ' αὐτὴν, καὶ ὀγδοὰς ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸ αὐτῆς, ὑψηλῆς ὑψηλοτέρα, καὶ θαυμασίας θαυμασιωτέρα· πρὸς γὰρ τὴν ἄνω φέρει κατάστασιν.*—*Orat.* xliv. § 5, p. 838 C.

Page 96, *line* 23. *παντὸς σοὶ, κ.τ.λ. Carm. Epitaph.* lxvi. tom. ii. p. 1132, fol. Par. 1840.

Page 96, *line* 26. 'Hypsistarii.' *Orat.* xli. § 2, tom. i. ut suprà.

"Their religion is made up of *Ἑλληνικὴ πλάνη*, and *νομικὴ τερατεία*. In right of the former, though they reject idols and sacrifices, they honor fire, &c. In right of the latter, they reverence the Sabbath, and are scrupulous about meats, though they reject circumcision."

Page 96, *line* penult. 'Basil.' In "Libro de Spiritu Sancto," c. xxvii. tom. iii. p. 56, fol. Par. 1730. The passage is a very interesting one, but is too long for quotation here.

Page 97, *line* 20. 'Gaudentius.' In "Primo Tractatu in Exod."

"Nam sextâ feriâ quâ hominem fecerat, pro eodem passus est; et die Dominicâ, quæ dicitur in Scripturis prima Sabbati, in quâ sumserat mundus exordium, resurrexit; ut qui primâ die creavit cœlum et terram, (unde postea hominem faciens figuravit), primâ etiam die omnem repararet hominem propter quem fecerat mundum."—*Apud Migne, Patrol.* tom. xx. col. 848, 8vo. Par. 1845.

Page 97, *line* 28. 'Theophilus.' "Edictum S. Theophili," *Apud Galland, Bibl. Patr.* tom. vii. p. 603.

Page 98, *line* 4. 'Jerom. . . . contrasts Jewish and Christian ordinances.' "Hæc est dies quam fecit Dominus, exsultemus et lætemur in eâ: omnes dies quidem fecit Dominus; sed cæteri dies possunt esse Judæorum, possunt esse Hæreticorum, possunt esse Gentilium: dies Dominica, dies Resurrectionis, dies Christianorum, dies nostra est. Unde et Dominica dicitur: quia in eâ Dominus victor ascendit ad Patrem. Quod si a Gentilibus dies Solis vocatur, et hoc nos libentissimè confitemur.

Hodie enim Lux mundi orta est, hodie Sol justitiæ ortus est." *Expl. Psalm.* cxviii. (cxvii.) tom. xi. part 2, col. 276 E.

Page 98, *line* 7. 'He is at great pains.' In Epist. ad Galat. c. iv. tom. vii. col. 456, 4to. Ven. 1766–71.

Page 98, *line* 23. 'Egyptian *cœnobitæ*.' Epist. xxii. tom. i. col. 120 D.

Page 98, *line* 28. 'Paula and her companions.' Epist. cviii. tom. i. col. 712 C. See also an interesting account of Paula in Isaac Taylor's "Logic in Theology." Essay iv.

Page 99, *line* 26. 'On a passage of Scripture.' Scil. in Ezechiel. c. xl. tom. v. col. 468.

Page 100, *line* 13. 'The law to be understood spiritually.' See for this "Adv. Jovinianum," lib. ii. tom. ii. col. 366; "Comm. in Amos," c. v. et vi. tom. v. col. 282, 313.

Page 100, *line* 15. 'We are not to be of the "sex diebus,"' &c. "In Esaiam," cap. lvi., tom. iv. p. 656. 'The precept not to move out of our place,' &c. "In Esaiam," c. lviii. tom. iv. p. 699. Curiously enough this is a comment on the passage, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath," and a reference is made in it to the *Sabbatismus* from sin mentioned in the Hebrews. Jerome anticipates Gregory the Great in his figurative interpretation of "bearing no burthen on the Sabbath."

Page 100, *line* 28. 'The Lord's Day and certain,' &c. "Nos quoque Dominicum diem et pascha solenniter observamus, et quaslibet alias Christianas dierum festivitates—sed quia intelligimus quo pertineant, non tempora observamus (to guard himself against Judaizing) sed quæ illis significantur temporibus... Repudiamus ergo eam carnalem cum Apostolo, et approbamus eam spiritalem cum Apostolo, et Sabbati quietem non observamus in tempore, sed signum temporale intelligimus, et ad æternam quietem, quæ illo signo significatur, aciem mentis intendimus. Repudiamus itaque temporum observantiam cum Apostolo, et temporalium signorum intelligentiam tenemus cum Apostolo; duorumque testamentorum differentiam sic probamus, ut in illo sint onera servorum, in isto gloria liberorum. Interpretatur Apostolus Sabbatum ad Hebræos cum dicit: *Remanet ergo Sabbatismus populo Dei.*"—*Augustin. c. Adim.* tom. x. col. 162. 4to. Bass. 1797—1807.

Page 101, *line* 11. 'Dies tamen Dominicus.' Ep. lv. cap. xxiii. tom ii. col. 181.

Page 101, *line* 14. 'To fast on the Sabbath, (he says).'

"Et de die quidem Sabbati facilior causa est, quia et Romana jejunat ecclesia, et aliæ nonnullæ, etiamsi paucæ, sive illi proximæ sive longinquæ: die autem Dominico jejunare scandalum est magnum, maximè posteaquam innotuit detestabilis multumque Fidei Catholicæ Scripturisque Divinis apertissimè contraria hæresis Manichæorum, qui suis auditoribus ad jejunandum istum tanquam constituerunt legitimum diem; per quod factum est ut jejunium illius die horribilius haberetur."—*Augustin. Epist.* 36, *ad Casulanum*, cap. 12, tom. ii. col. 105.

The Manichees denied that Christ had a real body. He was a mere phantom. Hence the weekly joy of the Lord's Day, by which men showed their belief that He rose and took again His body, with everything appertaining to man's nature, was offensive to them. They showed their dissent by fasting upon it.

Page 102, *line* 1. 'The genuineness of the treatise, "De Tempore," from which,' &c. On this Dr. Pusey remarks:—"The Sermon, formerly attributed to St. Augustine (Serm. 280, App.), which says, 'The holy doctors of the Church decreed to transfer all the glory of the Jewish rest (Sabbatismi) to the Lord's Day,' is later than the eighth century, since it incorporates a passage of Alcuin." Note A, on p. 391, *n. e.* by the Editor of Morris' "*Ephrem Syrus.*"

Page 102, *line* 9. 'The Apostolical Constitutions.'

On the subject of the genuineness of the Apostolical Constitutions, see Lardner, "Credibility, &c." vol. iv. pp. 194, *seq.* His own opinion is most strongly against their being an ante-Nicene collection, and he assigns as their probable date that which I have given in the text. In p. 215, he writes as follows:—

"Daillé, having summarily enumerated the fasts and feasts of the 'Constitutions,' and put down the assertion, that 'every one is guilty of sin, who fasts on the Lord's Day, or on the Pentecoste, or, in a word, on any festival of the Lord,' says very well, that the 'Constitutions' which have distinguished almost every day of the year, either as a fast or as a feast, could not have come from the Apostles of Christ."

And in p. 232, note, he gives an equally unfavorable opinion of another pretentious document, the so-called Apostolical 'Canons.' "These," he says, "which among other absurdities attribute the 'Constitutions' to Clemens Romanus, and consider them to be a

part of Canonical Scripture, are a gross imposture: the greater part of them belong probably to the seventh century. Archbishop Ussher calls their compiler or author, 'bipedum nequissimus, qui Clementis personam, (quinto post excessum ipsius sæculo,) induit. (Usser Prol. seu Diss. Ign. c. vi. fin.)"

Dr. Pusey, indeed, (Answers 444 and 459, *Commission on the Law of Marriage*), considers the Apostolic 'Canons' to be an ante-Nicene collection; and whatever can be urged in their favor is found in a work on the subject by Otto Carsten Krabbe, of Hamburg. I believe, however, that the very utmost that can be said of them, and indeed of the 'Constitutions,' is, that here and there an ancient ὅρος or determination can be detected in them. Bunsen's reconstruction of the 'Constitutions,' as the "Church and House-Book of the early Christians," and of the 'Canons,' as the "Law-Book of the ante-Nicene Church," may be consulted by those who are dissatisfied with Lardner's decision, (*Hippolytus and his Age*, vol. ii.)

Page 102, *line* ult. 'Here are some of its expressions:—

'He that fasts,' &c.

Ἔνοχος γὰρ ἁμαρτίας ἔσται ὁ τὴν κυριακὴν νηστεύων, ἢ τὴν πεντηκόστην. Lib. v. c. xx. fin. Coteler. tom. i. p. 331.

'Keep as festivals,' &c.

Τὸ σάββατον μέντοι καὶ τὴν κυριακὴν ἑορτάζετε. Lib. vii. c. xxiii. p. 372.

'Every Sabbath, except,' &c.

Πᾶν μέντοι σάββατον, ἄνευ τοῦ ἑνὸς, καὶ πᾶσαν κυριακὴν ἐπιτελοῦντες συνόδους εὐφροσύνεσθε. Lib. v. c. xx. p. 331.

'Let the servants work five days,' &c.

Ἐγὼ Πέτρος καὶ ἐγὼ Παῦλος διατασσόμεθα· ἐργαζέσθωσαν οἱ δοῦλοι πέντε ἡμέρας· σάββατον δὲ καὶ κυριακὴν σχολαζέτωσαν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, διὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς εὐσεβείας. Lib. viii. c. xxxiii. p. 419.

'Assemble yourselves,' &c.

Μάλιστα δὲ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου, καὶ ἐν τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναστασίμῳ τῇ κυριακῇ, σπουδαιοτέρως ἀπαντᾶτε. Lib. ii. c. 59. p. 270.

How the straitness of some of these injunctions and the very existence of others can be reconciled with anything in the ante-Nicene Church, of the West, or even of the East, I leave to the judgment of the reader. The 'Constitutions,' however, are a document belonging especially to the post-Nicene Eastern Church,

in parts of which, at any rate, the spurious honor paid to the Sabbath has resulted in a strange combination of Judaism and Christianity. Here are a few illustrations of this statement, showing how the delusion spread into Ethiopia:

"Scaliger tells us," says Dr. Heylin ("History of the Sabbath," p. 472), "that the Habassines, or Ethiopian Christians, call both Saturday and Sunday Sabbaths; the one the Jews' Sabbath, the other Christ's Sabbath."

Thorndike's Oxford Editor annotates on "The Laws of the Church," B. III. c. xxi. § 26: "The Ethiopians observed both Sabbath and Lord's Day simultaneously up to (at least) A.D. 1534: according to Zaga Zabo, an Ethiopian bishop, in his 'Declar. Fidei et Relig. Æthiop.' addressed to Damian and Goes, 'De Æthiop. Moribus,' pp. 494, 495; in fin. P. Martyr, 'De Rebus Oceanicis,' 8vo. Col. 1574; and so also Scaliger, 'Computus Eccles. Æthiop.'; ap. Joseph. Scalig. 'De Emend. Temp.' lib. vii. p. 629. Lug. Bat. 1598."

Dr. Heylin adds: "Bellarmine thinks that they derived this observation of the Saturday or Sabbath from the 'Constitutions' ascribed to Clemens, which, indeed, do frequently press the observation of that day with no less fervour than the Sunday."

But we get down to the present day in Harris' "Highlands of Ethiopia." He has mentioned in various places the observance of Sunday, but in vol. iii. pp. 150, 151, he writes thus: "The Jewish Sabbath is strictly observed throughout the kingdom. The ox and the ass are at rest. Agricultural pursuits are suspended. Household avocations must be laid aside, and the spirit of idleness reigns throughout the day. By order of the (Great) Council of Laodicea, the Oriental Churches were freed from this burden; and the industrious gladly availed themselves of the ecclesiastical licence to work on the Saturday. Here, however, the ancient usage agreed too well with a people systematically indolent; and when, a few years ago, one daring spirit presumed, in advance of the age, to burst the fetters of superstition, his Majesty the King of Shoa, stimulated by the advice of besotted monks, issued a proclamation, that whoso violated the Jewish Sabbath should forfeit his property to the royal treasury, and be consigned to the state dungeon." Major Harris mentions many more instances of Judaism.

Another curious exemplification of the intrusion of Judaism

into Christianity is supplied by Dr. Grant, in a work of his already quoted, (*Nestorians*, p. 171,) "The Sabbath," he says, "is regarded with a sacredness among the mountain tribes which I have seen among no other Christians in the East. I have repeatedly been told by Nestorians of the plain that their brethren in the mountains would immediately kill a man for travelling or labouring on the Sabbath; and there is abundant reason to believe that this was formerly done, though it has ceased since the people have become acquainted with the practice of Christendom on the subject. While in the mountains, I made repeated inquiries concerning the observance of that remarkable statute of the Jews, which required that 'whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath-day, he shall surely be put to death;' and I was everywhere told that this statute had formerly been literally executed. Nor does there appear to be any motive for deception, since the practice is now disapproved of by all. There are said to be Nestorians now in Tiyâry who will not kindle a fire on the Sabbath to cook their food; but their cold winters oblige them to do it for necessary warmth. On the plain there is much desecration of the Lord's Day; but can the execution of the Mosaic ritual regarding the Sabbath, by the independent Nestorians, be accounted for in any other way than as a remnant of Judaism? Where, except among God's people, to whom this peculiar law was immediately promulgated, can we find a parallel case? The Nestorians have also the 'preparation before the Sabbath,' commencing about three hours before sunset on Saturday, when all labour should cease, except what is necessary to prepare for spending a quiet Sabbath. But the rule has in a measure fallen into disuse."

These Nestorians, as pictured by Dr. Grant, agree with the Nazarenes in observing the Jewish law in its strictness with regard to the Sabbath, but differ from them, (at least so I gather from the language), in having their Sabbath on the Lord's Day, or Sunday, instead of on Saturday. In this respect, supposing their practice to be ancient, they anticipate the Sunday Sabbatarian view of modern times. "They also have," says Dr. Grant, "*the preparation before the Sabbath*"; this is the Jewish *parasceue*, shifted from Friday. Their preparation begins at three o'clock on Saturday. This reminds us of that piece of Ecclesiastical Sab-

batarianism in the Church of Rome, which appears in the law of Edgar, 'that the Lord's Day is to commence at three o'clock in the afternoon on Saturday, and to last until the dawn of Monday.' See Lecture III. p. 119. As to the Jewish severities transferred from the Sabbath to the Lord's Day, Dr. Grant might have found a parallel in the draft of the laws of the colony of Massachusetts. See Lecture VII. p. 285.

Page 104, *line* 10. 'Augustine.' "Sabbatum, in præsenti tempore, otio quodam corporaliter languido et fluxo et luxurioso celebrant Judæi: vacant enim ad nugas; et quum Deus præceperit Sabbatum, illi in his quæ Deus prohibet, exercent Sabbatum. Vacatio nostra à malis operibus; vacatio illorum à bonis operibus est. Melius est enim arare quam saltare. Illi à bono opere vacant; ab opere nugatorio non vacant." *In Psalm.* xci. tom. vi. col. 235 D.

'Chrysostom.' Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῶν βιωτικῶν ἀπαλλαγέντες πραγμάτων, τοῖς πνευματικοῖς οὐ προσεῖχον, σωφροσύνῃ, καὶ ἐπιεικείᾳ, καὶ ἀκροάσει θείων λογίων· ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον ἐποίουν, γαστριζόμενοι, μεθύοντες, διαῤῥηγνύμενοι, τρυφῶντες.—Hom. i. *de Lazaro*, tom. i. p. 717 A.

'Cyril of Alexandria,' and 'Theodoret,' says Bingham, "Christian Antiq." B. XX. 2. 4, apply to the Jews of their day those words in Amos vi. 3, ἐφαπτόμενοι σαββάτων ψευδῶν (LXX. Vers.), and charge them with keeping false Sabbaths; and he quotes from Chrysostom a similar application of the same passage.

'Prudentius' writes severely against the Jews. "Apotheos." verse 420, seq. In Sharpe's "History of Egypt," p. 533, mention is made of its being a common custom of the Jews in the time of Cyril of Alexandria to frequent the theatres on the Sabbath to see the dancing. See for his authority, Socrates, Eccl. Hist. B. VII. c. xiii.

Page 104, *line* 14. See Hosea ii. 11. Amos vi. 3—6, (according to LXX.); viii. 4—6. Isaiah lvi. 1—8; and, by implication, lviii. 13. Ezekiel xx. 10—26; xxii. 8, 26; and, by implication, xliv. 24.

Page 104, *line* 18. 'The proverbial expression, "Luxus Sabbatarius," which, &c.' "De luxu autem illo Sabbatario, narrationi nec supersedendum est, qui nec latentes potest latere personas." Sidon. Apollin. lib. i. Epist. 2, apud Galland. Bibl. Patr. tom. x. p. 465 A.

Page 104, *line* 21. 'Sabbat.'

The account of the meanings of *Sabbat* in *Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française* is curious, as showing how a word originally denoting repose and peacefulness of body and soul, has become a bye-word and a reproach. The Article stands thus, only slightly abbreviated.

"SABBAT. Nom donné chez les Juifs au dernier jour de la semaine. Sabbat signifie aussi, L'assemblée nocturne que, suivant l'opinion populaire, les sorciers tiennent pour adorer le diable. *Le bruit était que les sorciers tenaient leur sabbat dans cette forêt.* Il se dit, figurément et familièrement, d'Un grand bruit qui se fait avec désordre, avec confusion, tel que l'on s'imagine celui du Sabbat des sorciers. *Quel sabbat fait-on là haut?* Il se dit aussi, figurément et populairement, Des criailleries d'une femme contre son mari, ou d'un maître contre ses valets. *Leur maître leur fit un beau sabbat quand ils revinrent. Il m'a fait un sabbat du diable, un sabbat enragé.*"

I have little doubt that this change of the meaning of Sabbat from *rest* to *unrest* was mainly owing to the Jews' employment of their holy day in the riotous manner described in the Fathers. Their Sabbaths were considered a mockery of religion—and a noisy mockery. From the idea of mockery the word was used to denote the rites of sorcerers, who were supposed to travesty religious offices, and defile holy things; and from the idea of noise, it was transferred ironically to describe a noisy scene, whether abroad or at home, where quiet might have been expected.

Something, however, may be attributable to the *animus* towards the Jews which was visible even in the times of the Roman satirists. If so, that judgment is strongly confirmed, "They please not God, and are contrary to all men." (1 Thess. ii. 15.) The fierce antipathy which they inspired may have crystallized in this desecration of the word "Sabbath."

In the same way in German, I find in Dr. Hilpert's Dictionary as a figurative sense of the word *Sabbat*, "The meeting and rejoicings of fabled assemblies of witches, devils, imps, hobgoblins, upon the Blocksberg," &c. "*Hier hielten böse Geister ihren Sabbat.*" Here malignant spirits have held their Sabbath or hellish revelries.

The change from "keeping holy-day" into "holiday-making," *i.e.* merry-making, is somewhat of the same character.

Page 104, *line* penult. 'Chrysostom extracts a spiritual meaning.'

Κύριος γάρ, φησιν, ἐστὶ τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λέγων. Ὁ δὲ Μάρκος καὶ περὶ τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως αὐτὸν τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι φησίν. Ἔλεγε γάρ· τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο, οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν ἐκολάζετο ὁ τὰ ξύλα συνάγων; ὅτι εἰ ἔμελλον καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ καταφρονεῖσθαι οἱ νόμοι, σχολῇ γ' ἂν ὕστερον ἐφυλάχθησαν. Καὶ γὰρ πολλὰ ὠφέλει παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τὸ σάββατον καὶ μεγάλα· οἷον, ἡμέρους ἐποίει πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους εἶναι καὶ φιλανθρώπους· ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν πρόνοιαν καὶ τὴν δημιουργίαν.—*Chrysost. in Matt.* xii. 8. *Hom.* xxxix. § 3, tom. vii. p. 434.

And, again—

Τί τοίνυν σαββάτου χρεία τῷ διὰ παντὸς ἑορτάζοντι, τῷ πολιτευομένῳ ἐν οὐρανῷ; ἑορτάζωμεν τοίνυν διηνεκῶς, καὶ μηδὲν πονηρὸν πράττωμεν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἑορτή. Ἀλλ' ἐπιτεινέσθω μὲν τὰ πνευματικὰ, καὶ παραχωρείτω τὰ ἐπίγεια, καὶ ἀργῶμεν ἀργίαν πνευματικὴν, τὰς χεῖρας ἐκ πλεονεξίας ἀφιστῶντες, τὸ σῶμα τῶν περίττων καὶ ἀνονήτων ἀπαλλάττοντες καμάτων, καὶ ὧν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τότε ὑπέμενεν ὁ τῶν Ἑβραίων δῆμος.—*Ibid.* p. 435.

Page 105, *line* 2. 'He refers to 1 Cor.'

Κατὰ μίαν σαββάτου, τουτέστι κυριακὴν, ἕκαστος ὑμῶν παρ' ἑαυτῷ τιθέτω θησαυρίζων ὅ, τι ἂν εὐοδῶται· ὅρα πῶς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ καιροῦ προτρέπει. Καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἡμέρα ἱκανὴ ἦν ἀγαγεῖν εἰς ἐλεημοσύνην· ἀναμνήσθητε γάρ, φησι, τίνων ἐτύχετε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ.—*Id. in* 1 *Cor.* xvi. 2, tom. x. p. 400.

Page 105, *line* 3. 'In his own eloquent manner.'

Ὅρα πῶς πάντα πάρεργα ἦν τοῦ κηρύγματος· πεντηκοστὴ τότε ἦν, καὶ κυριακὴ ἦν, ὁ δὲ καὶ μέχρι μεσονυκτίου διδασκαλίαν ἐκτείνει· οὕτω τῆς μαθητῶν σωτηρίας ἐφίετο, ὅτι οὐδὲ τὴν νύκτα ἐσίγα· ἀλλὰ τότε μᾶλλον διελέγετο, ἅτε ἡσυχίας οὔσης. Ὅρα πῶς καὶ πολλὰ διελέγετο, καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν τοῦ δείπνου τὸν καιρόν. Ἀλλὰ συνετάραξε τὴν ἑορτὴν ὁ διάβολος, οὐ μὴν ἴσχυσε, βαπτίσας τὸν ἀκροατὴν ὕπνῳ, καὶ κατενεγκών.—*Id. in Act.* xx. 7, tom. ix. p. 325.

Page 105, *lines* 4, 5. 'He desires some of his hearers.' See the title to Hom. x. on Genesis, tom. iv. p. 71. In the body of the Homily he calls the refection ἡ αἰσθητὴ τράπεζα, and the σύναξις, ἡ πνευματικὴ ἑστίασις.

Page 105, *line* 11. 'He has a very remarkable passage.' Hom. x. on Genesis, tom iv. p. 80.

Page 106, *line* 1. 'Cyril of Alexandria.'

Οὐκοῦν ἀνάπαυσις μὲν ἡ πρώτη τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἡμέρα, τὸν ἐν ἀρχαῖς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καιρὸν ὑποφαίνουσα· ἀνάπαυσις δὲ ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ ὀγδόη καθ' ἣν ἀνεβίω Χριστὸς, προσηλώσας τῷ ἰδίῳ σταυρῷ τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον, καὶ εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς θανάτου καὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἐξελὼν, ποινῆς ἀπαλλάξῃ καὶ πόνων, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἀνάπαυσιν δι' αὐτοῦ κερδάνωμεν.—*Cyril. Alex. de Adorat. in Spir. et Verit.* lib. xvii. tom. i. p. 620 B.

And, again—

Τοῖς φυλάττουσι τὰ σάββατα αὐτοῦ, Χριστοῦ δηλονότι· ἕτερα δ' ὡς ἔφην, τὰ αὐτοῦ σάββατα παρὰ τοῦ νόμου. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἐν τύποις, τὰ δὲ τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας καταφαιδρύνεται κάλλει. Καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐπιλεξαμένοις ἃ αὐτὸς βούλεται, καὶ ἀντεχομένοις τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ· βούλεται δὲ Χριστὸς οὐ τὰ ἐν σκιαῖς καὶ γράμμασι νομικῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ τῇ παρ' αὐτοῦ· δῆλον δὲ ὅτι τῇ νέᾳ τε καὶ εὐαγγελικῇ.—*Id. in Esaiam*, lib. v. tom. ii. p. 790.

Page 106, *line* 4. 'The Jews were prone.'

Ἐπιλαθόμενοι δὲ τῶν πατρίων ἐθῶν, καὶ τὴν προγονικὴν εὐσέβειαν ἀρνησάμενοι, πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ψευδολατρείας ἐτράποντο . . . ἡλίῳ μὲν χρῆναι προσκυνεῖν ὑπελάμβανον, οὐρανῷ δὲ καὶ γῇ, σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις, καὶ τίνι γὰρ οὐχὶ τῶν στοιχείων τὴν Θεῷ πρέπουσαν δόξαν ἀπονέμειν ᾤοντο δεῖν; . . . ἐπειδὴ δέ πως ἐχρῆν καὶ διὰ πράγματος ἐναργοῦς ἐπαναγκάζειν ὥσπερ καὶ οὐχ ἑκόντας ὁμολογεῖν, ὡς πεποίηται μὲν οὐρανὸς, ἥλιος δὲ καὶ σελήνη, καὶ ἄστρα, καὶ γῆ, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη δὲ σύμπασα κτίσις ταῖς τοῦ δημιουργήσαντος τέχναις εἰς τὸ εἶναι κεκίνηται, συσχηματίζεσθαι κελεύει τῷ δημιουργῷ, καὶ καταλύοντας ἐν σαββάτῳ, τῆς ἑορτῆς τὴν αἰτίαν εἰδέναι βούλεται· κατέλυσε γὰρ, φησὶν ὁ Θεὸς, ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ. Οἱ γὰρ καταλύοντι τῷ δημιουργῷ συγκαταλύειν σπουδάζοντες, πῶς οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσαιεν, καὶ μάλιστα σαφῶς, ὡς πεποίηται μὲν τὰ σύμπαντα, εἷς δὲ ἁπάντων δημιουργὸς, καὶ τεχνίτης ἐστί; Συμβέβηκε τοίνυν, διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὸ σάββατον ἀργίας, καὶ τὸν περὶ τῆς θεότητος εἰσφέρεσθαι λόγον τοῖς ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ τὸν ἁπάντων τεχνίτην καὶ δημιουργὸν ἐπιγινώσκεσθαι φύσιν, καὶ τὴν τῶν ὁρωμένων στοιχείων οὐκ ἀγνοεῖσθαι δουλείαν.—*Cyril. Alex. Hom.* vi. *de Fest. Paschal.* tom. v. part. 2, p. 76.

Page 106, *line* 12. 'Theodoret condemns the Ebionites.' He says τὸ μὲν σάββατον κατὰ τὸν Ἰουδαίων τιμῶσι νόμον, τὴν δὲ κυριακὴν καθιεροῦσι παραπλησίως ἡμῖν.—*De Fabulis Hær.* ii. 1, tom. iv. p. 328. Hal. 1769—1774.

Page 106, *line* 22. 'The Sabbath was not' &c. Τῆς δὲ τοῦ

σαββάτου φυλακῆς, οὐχ ἡ φύσις διδάσκαλος, ἀλλ' ἡ θέσις τοῦ νόμου. —and again, *τὴν δὲ τοῦ σαββάτου φυλακὴν μόνον τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἐφύλαττεν ἔθνος. In Ezech.* c. xx. tom. ii. p. 826.

Page 106, *line* 24. 'It had its moral and political uses.'—*Διὰ τί τὸ σάββατον τῇ ἀργίᾳ τετίμηκεν; φιλανθρωπίαν τὸν λαὸν ἐξεπαίδευσεν.—Theodoret. in Exod.* Quæst. 42, tom. i. p. 153.

Ὥσπερ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ τὴν περιτομὴν δεδοὺς ἔφη· καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖον ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν· οὕτω καὶ περὶ σαββάτου νομοθετῶν ἔφη· ἔστι γὰρ σημεῖον ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν. τὸ γὰρ καινὸν τῆς πολιτείας ἀεὶ τοῦ νομοθέτου τὴν μνήμην ἀνθεῖν παρεσκεύαζεν. καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἐχώριζε· καθάπερ γὰρ τὰς ποίμνας καὶ τὰς ἀγελὰς αἱ σφραγίδες δηλοῦσιν, οὕτω τὰ τῆς τῶν Ἑβραίων πολιτείας ἐξαίρετα, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων αὐτοὺς διεῖργε, καὶ τὸν νομοθέτην προσεδρεύειν ἐδίδασκεν.—Quæst. 65, *in Exod.* tom. i. p. 170.

Page 106, *line* penult. 'Socrates.' Hist. Eccl. Lib. VI. cap. viii.

Page 107, *line* 6. 'And a third continuator, Sozomen.' See Lecture III. p. 87.

Page 107, *line* 10. Suiceri Thesaurus, in voce Κυριακή.

Page 107, *line* 24. 'Various other writers.' Ephrem Syrus, for instance, the author of Rhythms, or Poetical Discourses, which he probably composed on finding that the Hymns of Bardesanes, the heretic, had great influence on the minds of the people. My learned friend, the Rev. R. Payne Smith, of the Bodleian, informs me that in the two passages of Ephrem's commentaries where he mentions the Sabbath he is thinking of anything but the Lord's Day. On Gen. c. ii. 3, he says, "by the temporal Sabbath granted to the temporal people, God depicts the mystery granted to the eternal people in the eternal world." On Exod. c. xvi. he takes another view. "The Sabbath was granted for the sake of slaves, of hirelings, the oxen, and the asses." In other works he speaks of its temporary, ceremonial, remedial, and typical character. The Lord's Day he does not mention except by implication; as where he calls Palm Sunday, "One (*i.e.* Day One) in the week of Hosannahs." See the title of the "Rhythm against the Jews, delivered upon Palm Sunday," in Morris' "Translation of Select Works of S. Ephrem the Syrian." Oxford, 1847.

Page 107, *line* penult. 'Cœperat,' &c. Cœl. Sedul. Carmen Paschal. v. 315—322; *Migne Patrol.* vol. xiv. p. 738.

Page 108, *line* 14. 'The Council of Eliberis.' "Si quis in

civitate positus tres Dominicas ad ecclesiam non accesserit, tanto tempore abstineat, ut correptus esse videatur."—*Conc. Elib.* canon xxi. Labbé, tom. ii. col. 9.

Page 108, *line* 19. 'The Council of Gangra.'

Εἴ τις διὰ νομιζομένην ἄσκησιν ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ νηστεύοι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.—*Conc. Gangr.* canon xviii. Labbé, tom. ii. col. 1104.

Εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησιάζοι, καὶ καταφρονῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐθέλοι πράττειν, μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.—Canon vi. col. 1101.

Εἴ τις διδάσκοι τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐκαταφρόνητον εἶναι, καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ συνάξεις, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.—Canon v. col. 1101.

Page 108, *line* 26. 'The Council of Sardica.'

Μέμνησθε δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ προάγοντι χρόνῳ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν κεκρικέναι, ἵνα εἴ τις λαϊκὸς ἐν πόλει διάγων, τρεῖς κυριακὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τρισὶν ἑβδομάσι μὴ συνέρχοιτο, ἀποκινοῖτο τῆς κοινωνίας.—*Conc. Sardic.* canon xi. Labbé, tom. iii. col. 20.

Page 108, *line* 28. 'The Council of Antioch.'

Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκουόντας, μὴ κοινωνοῦντας δὲ εὐχῆς ἅμα τῷ λαῷ, ἢ ἀποστρεφομένους τὴν μετάληψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας κατά τινα ἀταξίαν· τούτους ἀποβλήτους γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἕως ἂν ἐξομολογησάμενοι καὶ δείξαντες κάρπους μετανοίας, καὶ παρακαλέσαντες, τυχεῖν δυνηθῶσι συγγνώμης.—*Conc. Antioch.* canon ii. Labbé, tom. ii. col. 1309.

Page 109, *line* 4. 'The First Council of Toledo.'

"De his qui intrant in ecclesiam, et deprehenduntur nunquam communicare, admoneantur, quod si non communicant, ad pœnitentiam accedant; si communicant, non super abstineantur; si non fecerint, abstineantur."—*Conc. Tolet.* I. can. xiii. Labbé, tom. iii. col. 1000.

Page 109, *lines* 6, 25, *and* 28. 'The Fourth Council of Carthage.'

"Sacerdote verbum faciente in ecclesiâ, qui egressus de auditorio fuerit, excommunicetur."—*Conc. Carthag.* IV. canon xxiv. Labbé, tom. iii. col. 953.

"Qui die solenni, prætermisso solenni ecclesiæ conventu ad spectacula vadit, excommunicetur."—Canon lxxxviii. col. 958.

"Qui Dominico die studiosè jejunat, non credatur catholicus."—Canon lxiv. col. 956.

The Fourth Council of Carthage is sometimes called "The Code of the African Church." Mansi holds that it is more properly so designated, and he considers it to be a compilation from the decrees of various synods. The whole subject of the Councils of Carthage is very intricate. Three at least were held under Cyprian. Vide note to Lecture II. p. 65, l. 5. Then sundry others intervened which were called *conciliabula.* Then came the four usually called Councils of Carthage, A.D. 348, 390, 397, 436, respectively. But the dates of each, and the very existence of the last, are matters of dispute. No two authorities agree together.

Page 109, *line* 9. 'The Council of Laodicea.' Can. xxix. Labbé, ii. col. 570.

Dr. Heurtley, in commenting on εἴγε δύναιντο, observes that probably the early Christians were not masters of their own time. Univ. Serm. on Lord's Day, p. 15.

Page 110, *line* 2. 'Eusebius mentions a law,' &c. *De Vit. Const.* iv. 18.

Page 110, *line* 6. 'By another law.' *Ibid.* iv. 19, 20.

Page 110, *line* 11. 'Negotiorum intentio.' *Cod. Theod.* xi. 7. 13.

Page 110, *line* 14. 'Abolished the spectacles.'

"Nullus Solis die populo spectaculum præbeat, nec divinam venerationem confectâ solennitate confundat."—*Cod. Theod.* xv. 5. 2.

See Canon Robertson, "History of the Church," vol. i. p. 321.

Page 110, *line* 17. 'Theodosius the younger.'

"Dominico, qui Septimanæ totius primus est Dies, (*&c. &c. specifying various other holy days and seasons*) omni Theatrorum atque Circensium voluptate, per universas urbes, earundem populis denegatâ, totæ Christianorum ac fidelium mentes Dei cultibus occupentur. Si qui etiam nunc vel Judææ impietatis amentiâ, vel stolidæ Paganitatis errore atque insaniâ detinentur, aliud esse supplicationum noverint tempus, aliud voluptatum. Ac ne quis existimet, in honorem Numinis Nostri, veluti majore quâdam imperialis officii necessitate compelli, et nisi divinâ religione contemptâ spectaculis operam præstat, subeundam forsitan sibi nostræ serenitatis offensam, si minus circa nos devotionis ostenderit, quam solebat, nemo ambigat, quod tunc

maximè Mansuetudini Nostræ ab humano genere defertur, cum virtutibus Dei Omnipotentis ac meritis universi obsequium orbis impenditur."—*Cod. Theod.* xv. 5. 5.

Page 110, *line* 21. 'Leo and Anthemius.'

"Dies festos Majestati altissimæ dedicatos, nullis volumus voluptatibus occupari, nec ullis exactionum vexationibus profanari. Dominicum itaque diem ita semper honorabilem decernimus et venerandum, ut a cunctis executionibus excusetur; nulla quemquam urgeat admonitio: nulla fidejussionis flagitetur exactio: tacent apparitio: advocatio delitescat: sit ille dies a cognitionibus alienus: præconis horrida vox silescat: respirent a controversiis litigantes, et habeant fœderis intervallum: ad sese simul veniant adversarii non timentes: subeat animos vicaria pœnitudo: pacta conferant: transactiones loquantur. Nec hujus tamen religiosi diei otia relaxantes, obscœnis quemquam patimur voluptatibus detineri. Nihil eodem die sibi vindicet scena theatralis, aut Circense spectaculum, aut ferarum lacrimosa spectacula: et si in nostrum ortum aut natalem celebranda solennitas inciderit, differatur. Amissionem militiæ, proscriptionemque patrimonii sustinebit, si quis unquam hoc die festo spectaculis interesse [ausus fuerit], vel cujuscunque judicio apparitor prætextu negotii publici, seu privati, hæc, quæ hâc lege statuta sunt, crediderit temeranda."—*Cod. Justin.* iii. 12, 11.

Tertullian wrote a Treatise, "De Spectaculis," to prove that a Christian could not without a certain degree of guilt attend public games. This renders it clear that it was not attending the games on Sunday, but attending them at all, that the Ancients objected to. See Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, p. 384.

And compare for the sentiment, Tertullian, Apol. c. xxxv. "Hæccine dies solennes principum decent, quæ alios dies non decent?"

Page 111, *lines* 18 and 19. 'Manumissio—emancipatio.'

"Sicut indignissimum videbatur, diem Solis venerationis suæ celebrem, altercantibus jurgiis et noxiis partium contentionibus occupari, ita gratum ac jocundum est, eo die quæ sunt maximè votiva compleri. Atque ideo emancipandi et manumittendi die festo cuncti licentiam habeant, et super his rebus actus non prohibeantur."—*Cod. Theod.* ii. 8. 1.

Page 111, *line* 20. 'This law was followed.'

"Die Solis, (qui dudum faustus habetur), neminem Christianum

ab exactoribus volumus conveniri; contrà eos, qui id facere ausi sint, hoc nostri statuti interdicto periculum sancientes.—*Cod. Theod.* viii. 8. 1.

Page 111, *line* 23. 'And both enactments.'

"Solis die, quem Dominicum rite dixere majores, omnium omnino litium, negotiorum, conventionumque quiescat intentio: debitum publicum privatumque nullus efflagitet: ne apud ipsos quidem Arbitros, (vel in Judiciis flagitatos vel sponte delectos,) ulla sit agnitio jurgiorum. Et non modo notabilis, verum etiam sacrilegus judicetur, qui a sanctæ religionis instituto ritu ve deflexerit."—*Cod. Theod.* viii. 8. 1.

Page 112, *line* 1. 'Theodosius the Great confirmed all this.' *Cod. Theod.* ii. 8. 2.

Page 113, *line* 16. 'Place it above all purely Ecclesiastical ordinances.'

"But this few Christians would deny, except some Papists, who would bring down Apostolical Constitutions to a lower rank and rate, that the Pope and his General Council may be capable of laying claim to the like themselves; and so may make as many more laws for the Church as they please, and pretend such an authority for it as the Apostles had for them. By which pretence many would make too little distinction between God's Laws, given by His Spirit, and the Laws of a Pope and Popish Council; and call them all but *the Laws of the Church.* Whereas there is no Universal Head of the Church but Christ, who hath reserved Universal Legislation to Himself alone, to be performed by Himself personally, and by His Advocate the Holy Ghost, in His authorized and infallibly-inspired Apostles, who were the Promulgators and Recorders of them; all following Pastors being but, (as the Jewish priests were to Moses and the Prophets,) the preservers, the expositors and appliers of that Law."—*Baxter,* "*The Divine Appointment,*" *&c.* pp. 70, 71.

Page 116, *line* 24. 'Councils condescend.' *e. g.* The Third Council of Orleans, A.D. 538. Conc. Aurelian. III. canon 28. (Labbé ix. 19.)

Page 116, *line* 26. 'And not unfrequently contradict.' *e. g.* The Council of Auxerre, A.D. 578. Conc. Autissiodor. canon 15. (Labbé ix. 911.)

Page 116, *line* 27. 'The second Council of Macon.' Conc. Matiscon. II. canon 1. (Labbé ix. 947.)

Page 117, *line* 17. 'Clothaire, King of France.' See Dr. Heylin, "History of the Sabbath," part ii. c. 6. p. 469.

Page 117, *line* 21. 'A Synod held at Friuli.' Conc. Forojuliens. Canon 13. (Labbé xiii. 851.) See Dr. Heylin, (ut suprà,) part ii. c. v. pp. 447—448, and Dr. T. Young, "Dies Dominica," Prooem. p. penult.

Page 117, *line* 22, to *page* 118, *line* 16. This passage is from Neale, "Feasts and Fasts," page 98. He observes in a note that the *capitularies* were heads of instruction given by the Emperors to the officers called *Missi dominici*, whom they sent out to administer justice, and reform abuses in the several provinces; somewhat as in England the original justices in *eyre*.

Page 117, *line* 27. 'Mayence.' Conc. Moguntiac. canon 37. (Labbé xiv. 68.)

'Rheims.' Conc. Rhemens, canon 35. (Labbé xiv. 78.)

Page 118, *line* 24. 'Leo Philosophus.' See Neale, "Feasts and Fasts," pp. 91—92; and Lecture III. pp. 83 and 125.

Page 118, *line* penult. 'Ina, King of the West Saxons.' Enactment 3. (Johnson, Collect. vol. i. p. 132.)

Page 118, *line* ult. 'The Council of Berkhampstead.' Conc. Berghamstedense, canones 10, 11, 12. (Canones, &c. selecti H. D. Bruns, p. 312.)

Page 119, *line* 3. 'The Constitutions of Egbert, Abp. of York,' constit. 36. (Spelman, Conc. i. 264.)

Page 119, *line* 4. 'The Convention between.' &c. ch. 10, 11. (Spelman, Conc. i. 391.)

Page 119, *line* 6. 'The Council of Cloveshoff.' can. 14. (Spelman, Conc. i. 299.)

Page 119, *line* 7. 'A law of Athelstane.' Law 24. (Johnson's Collect. vol. i. p. 344.)

Page 119, *line* 8. 'In a law of Edgar the Peaceable.'

I found this law given in a very strange form in Selden's "Analecton Anglo-Britannicon," p. 99. "Dies Sabbati ab ipsâ diei Saturni horâ pomeridianâ tertiâ usque in Lunaris diei diluculum festus agitator." The employment of *Sabbatum* for Sunday struck me as unusual at this period, and on looking at Heylin, (Hy. of Sabbath, p. 475), I found that he quoted the law in the same form, but thought it necessary to apologise for it thus: "Where, by the way, though it be *Dies Sabbati* in the Latin, yet in the Saxon copy, it is only *Healde*, the Holy Day." Not

feeling satisfied with this explanation, I referred to Johnson, (Collection, vol. i. p. 244), and found that he rendered the law, "Let every Sunday be kept in a festival manner from the noon-tide on Saturday till Monday morning light," &c. On the word *noon-tide* he annotated, "That is, three in the afternoon according to our present account," adding, "Three in the afternoon was *hora nona* in the Latin account, and therefore called noon. How it came afterwards to signify mid-day I can but guess."

In this difficulty I referred the matter to my friend the Rev. John Earle, late Anglo-Saxon Professor at Oxford, and with his permission give his reply to my questions.

"Heylin's remark was made in the dark. True, the law begins with *Healde*, but this is the imperative of the verb to *hold*. 'Healde man ælces Sunnan-dæges freols.' *Teneat unusquisque omni Solis die festum.* 'Let all observe Sunday as a feast, or literally, let men keep holyday every Sunday, from,' &c.

"As for *Dies Sabbati*, of Selden and Heylin, I do not know where it originated. Wilkins' Latin version runs thus: "Quodlibet diei Solis festum celebretur ab horâ pomeridianâ diei Saturni, usque ad diluculum diei Lunæ, &c." This, though it does not exactly represent the construction of the Anglo-Saxon, is nearly right as to the several words. I append as much of the law as bears upon the subject, with an English translation, and a Latin version which is at least as old as the thirteenth century. All other Latin versions are by modern editors.

"'Healde man ælces Sunnan-dæges freols, fram non-tide þæs Sæternes-dæges oð þæs Monan-dæges lihtinge, be þam wite þe seo dom-boc tæcð, and ælcne oðerne mæsse-dæg swa he beboden beo; and man ælc beboden fæsten healde mid ælcere geornfulnesse, and ælces Frige-dæges fæsten, buton hit freols sy,' &c.

"'Keep holy day every Sunday from 'noon-tide' of Saturday to Monday's dawn; under the penalty which the doom-book directs—and every other mass-day as proclaimed—and every published fast is to be kept with all diligence, and every Friday's fast, except it (happen to) be a festival. . . .'

"Vetus Versio.] 'Et solenne diei Dominicæ conservetur ab horâ nonâ Sabbati usque ad lucidum diei Lunæ super forisfacturâ quam liber judiciorum docet; et omnis alia festivitas,

sicut a sacerdote nunciabitur; et omne indictum jejunium cum omni devotione servetur.'

"This version has *Dies Dominica.* So *Dies Sabbati* must be Selden's own rendering, or that of some editor whom he has followed with a carelessness very unusual in him, for *sunnandæges.*

"*Non-tide* in the original is not correctly expressed by *hora pomeridiana,* unless that phrase be taken to mean *hora pomeridiana tertia, i.e.* the *nona* or ninth hour, the first canonical hour for a religious office post meridiem. When the observance of the *hours* was usual, the phrase *hora pomeridiana* might at once point to the hour of *nones* or three o'clock, and not require the qualification *tertia* which appears in Selden and Heylin.

"*Non-tide* may have come to mean mid-day by the process suggested by Johnson, namely, from a practice growing prevalent of saying the office of nones immediately after the mid-day office, and so hastening the time of refection, which was not due till nones had been said. Thus the nones were brought very close to mid-day, and eventually gave mid-day the name of noon."

Page 119, *line* 19. 'It was a greater crime,' &c.

This is asserted (says Neale, "Feasts and Fasts," p. 110) in a law of Canute, re-enacting with some extensions a law of Alfred. He refers to Spelman, Conc. i. 41, (2d collection of Canute's laws, l. 14.) The law of Alfred is, "He that stealeth on a Sunday night, or on Christmas, &c., our will is, that he make satisfaction twofold."—*Johnson's Coll.* part i. p. 321.

Page 119, *line* 23. 'Alcuin.'

"Sure I am that Alcuinus, one of principal credit with Charles the Great, who lived about the end of the eighth century, saith clearly, that the observation of the former Sabbath had been translated very fitly to the Lord's Day by the custom and consent of Christian people. For speaking how the Sabbath was accounted holy in the former times, and that the Jews resting thereon, from all manner of work, did give themselves only to meditation and to fasting, he adds,—'cujus observationem mos Christianus ad diem Dominicum competentius transtulit.'" Thus Dr. Heylin, "History of the Sabbath," part ii. c. 5, pp. 449, 450. Whence Alcuin obtained his notion that the Jews at any time made the Sabbath a day of fasting, it is difficult to ascertain. But the passage is an instructive one,

as showing the growth of an Ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism of more than Jewish strictness.

Page 119, *line* 28. 'Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaulx.' See Dr. Heylin, "History of the Sabbath," part ii. c. 5, p. 457.

Page 120, *line* 2. 'Petrus Alphonsus.' See Dr. Heylin, ibid. part ii. c. 7, p. 479.

Page 120, *line* 9. 'Eustace, Abbot of Flay.' For the whole story, see Spelman, Conc. i. 128. The pretended letter demanded that the Lord's Day should last "ab horâ nonâ Sabbati (Saturday) usque ad solem surgentem die Lunæ." This, it will be remembered, was the time enjoined in Edgar's law. It is the time also enjoined in a law of Canute, A.D. 1017. (Johnson's Coll. part i. p. 507.) The following is Johnson's abridgment of the judgments. "A woman weaving after three o'clock on Saturday afternoon was struck with the dead palsy. A man that made a cake at the same time, when he came to eat it on the Lord's Day morning, blood flowed from it. Corn grinded by a miller was turned into blood, and the wheel of the mill stood immovable against the force of the waters. A woman put her paste into the heated oven at this time, and when she thought it baked, found it paste still. Another woman, by the advice of her husband, kept her paste till Monday morning wrapped up in a linen cloth, and then found it ready baked. I wish," concludes Johnson (Coll. p. ii. p. 95), "that no Protestants had vended the like tales."

Neale, "Feasts and Fasts," pp. 114, *seq.* mentions a somewhat similar message in Henry the Second's time, together with some strange instances of Sabbatarian superstition in reference to the Lord's Day.

Page 120, *line* 29. 'Thomas Aquinas.' See Dr. Heylin's "History of the Sabbath," part ii. c. 6, p. 463.

Page 121, *line* 5. 'Bellarmine." See Mr. Baden Powell, "Christianity without Judaism," p. 164.

Page 121, *line* 11. 'Abp. Chichele.' The mistake is one of so extraordinary a character, that I subjoin the very words of the Archbishop :—

"Cum nuper . . . delatum exstitit quod barbitonsores contrà legem Dei, sanctiones ecclesiasticas, et publicam honestatem, *die Dominico, videlicet die Septimo,* cui Dominus benedixit, quem sanctificavit, et in quo post opera sex dierum ab omni opere

requievit, a cunctis suis fidelibus illum instituit ejus exemplo ab omnibus servilibus operibus abstinere, domos et shoppas suas pro exercitio artis suæ apertas tenent, nec institutioni divinæ, nec diei reverentiæ in aliquo deferentes," &c.—*Wilkins, Conc. M. B.* tom. iii. p. 368.

Page 121, *line* 23. 'Tostatus, Bishop of Avila.' In Exod. c. xii. pp. 82—84, fol. Venet. 1596. See Dr. Heylin, part ii. c. 6, p. 463.

Page 123, *line* 21. 'Gregory the First.' Epist. lib. xi. c. 3.

Page 124, *line* 21. 'Theodulphus, Bishop of Orleans.' The document quoted in the text was originally drawn up by this Bishop for his own diocese; but it obtained a very general reputation, even where the name of the author was unknown. Spelm. Conc. i. 585, can. 41, calls its regulations the *capitula* of an unknown bishop. But see Johnson's Collection, part i. p. 466, canon 24:—"Dies vero Dominicus, quia in eo Deus lucem condidit, in eo Mannam eremo pluit, in eo Redemptor humani generis sponte pro salute nostra mortuus resurrexit, in eo Spiritum Sanctum super discipulos infudit; tantâ esse debet observantiâ, ut præter orationes, et Missarum Solennia, et ea quæ ad vescendum pertinent, nihil aliud fiat," &c.

Page 125, *line* 12. 'Pope Nicholas the First.' Neale, p. 99; Labbé xv. 414.

Page 126, *line* 3. 'Archbishop Islip.' A. D. 1362. Spelm. Conc. ii. 599; Johnson's Collections, part ii. p. 417; and Neale, "Feasts and Fasts," p. 125. There is a curious phrase in this document, referring to the evil employment of holydays, which is the more remarkable, considering the warning against Judaism which follows: "Nor do they *sabbatize* in honor to God, but to the scandal of Him and holy Church."

Page 126, *line* 10. 'Archbishop Nevile.' Spelm. Conc. ii. 702, quoted by Neale, "Feasts and Fasts," p. 125.

Page 127, *line* 9. 'Peter de Bruys.' He was burnt, A. D. 1130, by the populace at the instigation of the Clergy.

Page 127, *line* 16. 'The Waldenses.' See Hardwick, "Middle Ages," p. 314, note 5.

Page 127, *line* 19. 'The Lollards.' See Hardwick, "Middle Ages," p. 418.

Page 128, *line* 6. 'On the Continent.' Compare Hamon L'Estrange, "Alliance of Divine Offices," p. 86: "To proceed;

they have not only laid aside these holydays above specified, but even the Lord's Day itself, which our great adversaries themselves repute to be a day of Divine institution. True it is they make it a day of public assembling, but not for sacred concernments alone ; no, for civil also, having their markets kept upon those days. Till these obstacles be removed, we hold it not just that they pretend to the title of 'the best reformed Churches.'"

LECTURE IV.

Page 129, *line* 11. 'Primarily.' Compare the statement of Dr. Hawkins in note to Lecture II. p. 34.

Page 131, *line* 11. On the two senses of 'The law of Nature,' see Abp. Bramhall, "On the Sabbath and Lord's Day," p. 79.

"The law of nature is sometimes taken properly and strictly for the principles of moral honesty, dictated expressly to all intellectual creatures by natural reason; and in this sense the setting out a sufficient time for God's solemn worship is 'juris Divini naturalis,' a principle of the law of nature, but so is not the setting out a whole day for God's solemn worship. At other times the law of nature is taken more largely, so as to comprehend not only such express principles of moral honesty as nature dictateth to all intellectual creatures, but also such conclusions as are consentaneous and agreeable to those principles; and in this sense it is true that the setting apart a whole day for God's worship is 'juris Divini naturalis,' or dictated by reason to all intellectual creatures to be agreeable and consentaneous to the principles of moral honesty. The law of nature doth prescribe that a sufficient time be set apart for God's service; and whatsoever time be set apart, more or less, so it be sufficient, it is agreeable to this law, and made in pursuance of it. So this contradiction is vanished.

"The third difference hath less ground than the second; for I myself do readily acknowledge that the setting apart one day in seven for the solemn worship of God was 'juris Divini positivi,' a branch of Divine law, and that this law was not changeable by 'man or angel,' which is all that our Lord Primate, (Abp. Ussher), saith. But it was both changeable and actually changed by the same Divine authority that first gave it. And though it was changed from one seventh day to another, yet this was not by virtue of the Fourth Commandment, an old Mosaical law, which (so far as it was Mosaical) is abrogated, but by virtue of a new evangelical law, as hath been declared."

See also Bishop Francis White, "A Treatise," &c. p. 26, on the senses of the word "Moral," and Archbishop Bramhall,

p. 13 of the work just quoted. For exemplification of the difference between "moral" and "positive" laws or precepts, see Bishop Butler, "Analogy," Part II. c. 1.

Dr. Isaac Barrow, "An Exposition of the Decalogue," Works, vol. vi. p. 494, writes thus: "In fine, divers of the Fathers say, that all the commands in the Decalogue, excepting the Sabbath, do continue in force as naturally obligatory, and as confirmed by the Christian law." And he goes on to quote Augustine to the point.

And Cocceius, "De Sabbato," observes:—"Præceptum de Sabbato distinguitur a præceptis, quæ qui facit in eis vivet," alluding, of course, to Ezekiel, chap. xx. 11—13, 16—20, 21—24. These passages clearly intimate a distinction between God's "statutes and judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them," and "the Sabbaths which He gave them, to be a sign," &c.

Page 134, *line* 11. 'Archbishop Bramhall.' "On the Sabbath and Lord's Day," p. 20.

Page 135, *line* 15. 'Do we not read in Genesis ii. 3,' &c.

Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, "Occasional Sermons," Serm. xliv. p. 37, compares the primeval institution of marriage to a supposed primeval institution of Sabbath; but he forgets that while Genesis tells us in the former case of something like a revelation to man on the subject, there is no hint of such a revelation in the latter case. He says, "The law of the Sabbath dates from the same time as the law of marriage; both were given by God, both have been violated by man; but man's violations of the law, though they were universal, would never prove that the law was not given by God, or be any bar to the punishment of our violation of it." Here he has begged the question, that God did enjoin the Sabbath upon man at the same time that He instituted marriage. And he has also assumed that the non-mention of the Sabbath being observed by the Patriarchs, is as clear an evidence of their breaking that supposed commandment, as the mention of their polygamy is of their breaking the original law of marriage.

Bishop White, of Pennsylvania, in his "Lectures on the Catechism," pp. 63, seq., quite sees the difficulties in the way of allowing a patriarchal Sabbath. His testimony is useful as showing that Dr. Dwight's view is not universal in America.

Bishop Seabury, of Connecticut, appears to agree very much

with Dr. Dwight. See his "Discourses on various Subjects," Disc. VII. Obs. on History of the Sabbath, vol. i. p. 162. 1815.

Page 135, *line* 25. 'In Paradise.' Bishop Francis White (ut suprà), pp. 42, 43, has an eloquent passage on the state of man before the Fall.

Page 136, *line* 7. 'Bede,' quoted by Bp. Fr. White, (ut suprà,) p. 41.

Page 136, *line* 22. 'Archbishop Bramhall.' "On the Sabbath and Lord's Day," p. 20.

Page 137, *line* 6. 'Archdeacon Paley.' "M. and P. Phil." B. V. c. vi. Compare, on the question of the proleptical theory, Thorndike, "Of the Laws of the Church," c. xxi. § 13, Works, vol. iv. p. 493. In the next section he is strongly opposed to the assertion that traces of an hebdomadal division of time necessarily imply knowledge of the Sabbath.

Dr. Isaac Barrow, (ut suprà,) p. 509, referring to the mention of the creation-rest in the Fourth Commandment, says, "In all ceremonial institutions we may observe, that some significant circumstance is selected on purpose to instruct or excite us to practice, by representing to our fancy the nature and intention of the main duty required; as in circumcision, in the passover, in baptism, and other ritual constitutions, it is not hard to perceive: so, it being God's design to enforce the performance of that excellent duty, by appropriating a time thereto, we may conceive that He therefore especially selected that day as most apt to mind them, to whom this law was given, of the history of the creation, the reflecting upon and celebrating which was the main duty intended."

Page 140, *line* penult. Selden, "De Jur. Nat. et Gentium," Lib. III. c. xvi, xvii. Bishop Kaye, "Justin Martyr," p. 95, note, refers, apparently with approval, to Selden. And he recommends his work to all who shall engage in the controversies relating to the Sabbath. Morer, in his Ἡμέρα Κυριακή, quoted already, shows, with some ingenuity, that almost any number up to twelve, so far as heathen testimony goes, might be made out to be sacred, pp. 150, seq. Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, "Occasional Sermons," Ser. xliv. p. 37, restates from Grotius, De Verit. i. 16, the argument overthrown by Selden; and he has overlooked a note of Le Clerc on the passage, in which he refers to Selden, and warns against confusion of the seventh of

the month and the seventh of the week. There is some curious matter on the subject of the origin of divisions of time, in "Time and Faith," vol. i. c. i. Compare Bishop Ironside, "Seven Questions on the Sabbath," pp. 85, seq., and Sam. Frisius, "De Sabb. Gentil."

Page 141, *line* 20. 'Before the time of Moses.' Of course, I mean before the time of the promise of the manna, and the cessation of it on the seventh day. One other trace of sevens occurs anterior to that date, in Exod. xii. 15—19. It is there said, that on the seventh day there shall be a holy convocation, and that no manner of work shall be done on it; and hence it is argued that the Sabbath was known then: but on more closely inspecting the passage, it appears that the same thing is said of the first day as of the seventh. Compare Leviticus xxiii. 7, 8, with Gen. xxix. 27, where the marriage week is mentioned without reference to the Sabbath; and Judges xiv. 12, which speaks of the seven days of the feast at Samson's marriage.

Page 141, *line* 23. 'Lights in the firmament,' Gen. i. 14. Heng stenberg, "Lord's Day," p. 77, states this argument in outline.

Page 143, *line* 24. 'It is mentioned in the tables of the Ten Commandments.' Bp. Sanderson determines "that no part of the law delivered by Moses to the Jews doth bind Christians under the Gospel by virtue of that delivery; no, not the Ten Commandments themselves, but least of all the Fourth, which all confess to be, at least, in some part ceremonial."

Baxter, "Divine Appointment," &c. Appendix, c. iv. is at some pains to prove—1. That the Decalogue written in stone hath more than the law of nature.

2. That all the law of nature was not in the tables of stone.

3. That there is more of the law of nature in other parts of Moses' law, conjunct with the Decalogue, than is in the Decalogue alone.

And in the body of his work, c. vii. he says, "The whole Law of Moses, formally *as such*, is ceased or abrogated by Christ. I say, *as such*, because materially the same things that are in that Law may be the matter of the Law of Nature and of the Law of Christ."

Bp. Jer. Taylor says, in reference to the Second Commandment:—

"God was pleased to appoint such temporary instruments of a

moral duty as were fitted to the necessities of that people, (the Jews); but such instruments were but like temporary supporters, placed there but till the building could stand alone." See his "Ductor Dubit." B. II. c. ii. Rule 6, in which he is occupied with proving that "Not every thing in the Decalogue is obligatory on Christians."—Vol. xii. p. 368, Heber's Edit.

Page 144, *line* 23. 'If according to his own admission,' &c.

Bp. Francis White, "Treatise of the Sabbath Day," pp. 57 and 58, puts the argument the other way :—

"If God's speaking or writing the Decalogue makes it exclusively moral, then all other commandments not so spoken or written are exclusively temporary (or positive)."

"This, as he shows by an induction of many instances, is not the case," as Deut. xv. 7, 8; Lev. xix. 17; Deut. x. 19; Lev. xix. 14. "Therefore, God's writing or speaking some laws does not make them exclusively moral."

Page 145, *line* penult. 'Bp. Beveridge.' "On the Catechism," Fourth Commandment. Works, Vol. II. viii. p. 80.

Thorndike, "Of the Laws of the Church," B. III. c. xxi. § 14, supposes the word "remember" to have been used "because the Israelites forgot God's first command at the giving of manna; therefore it is reason they should be charged to remember it for the future." He utterly repudiates the notion of there having been a Patriarchal Sabbath.

Abp. Whately, "Thoughts," &c. p. 10, says that "The expression does not necessarily imply that the precept had been *before* observed, but merely that it was one liable to be violated through negligence and forgetfulness."

Page 147, *line* 6. 'This point of time.'

Selden, "De Jure, &c." III. 9, says that the Talmudists placed the origin of the Sabbath at Marah, grounding their supposition on Exodus xv. 25: "There He made them a statute and an ordinance, and there He proved them."

Page 149, *line* 9. 'Hengstenberg.' "On the Lord's Day," pp. 7, seq. (Martin's translation.)

It is a curious fact that, whereas the Hebrew, and the Vulgate, and our last translation have in the concluding clause of the Fourth Commandment, "The Lord blessed the *Sabbath Day*, and hallowed it," our Prayer-Book version, has (following the LXX. *τὴν ἑβδόμην*), "The Lord blessed the *Seventh Day*, and hallowed

it." The Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference noticed this discrepancy, and observed very pertinently, that "King James had caused the Bible to be new translated to little purpose," if the word Sabbath was not restored. They had evidently reason on their side; and it is difficult to see why the concession demanded was not made. Nothing, except accuracy, is gained on either side by one word or the other, for the Sabbath and the Seventh are so completely identified throughout the commandment that it is impossible to distinguish them. The Hebrew says, "Remember *the* Sabbath Day," &c. in Exod. xx. 8. "But *the* Seventh Day is *a* Sabbath of the Lord thy God," 10. "And rested *the* Seventh Day; wherefore the Lord blessed *the* Sabbath Day," &c. v. 11. The text of the Lecture, p. 148, observes upon a similar delicacy in the use of the article, which has escaped our translators. In the Book of Genesis it is said that God rested יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי on the Seventh Day, but the Seventh is not called *the Sabbath*. (The supposed connexion of the Hebrew words denoting *Sabbath* and *Seventh* respectively is quite fanciful.)

Page 150, *line* 21. 'No doubt remains then.' Kurtz, "History of the Old Covenant," vol. ii. pp. 109, 110, (Martin's transl.) writes thus on the question of the existence of an ante-Mosaic Sabbath:—

"There are still two points, however, about which a great deal has been written on both sides, and on which we must give our opinion as briefly as possible, viz. on the observance of the Sabbath, and the existence of any priestly institution in the ante-Mosaic times. With reference to the *Sabbath*, see *Iken*, pp. 26 sqq. The week of seven days is the earliest measure of time among all nations, (v. G. H. Schubert Lehrb. d. Sternkunde, Erlangen, 1847, pp. 204 seq.), and *Philo* justly designates the weekly cycle as *πάνδημον καὶ τοῦ κόσμου γενέσιον*. (De opif. mundi). We need not discuss the question here, whether the universal agreement in this respect is to be explained on the ground of agreement between such a division and the four phases of the moon, or from the number of the planets, or from the symbolical dignity of the number seven, or whether it should rather be referred to a universal revelation made before the dispersion of the people, in which case we should have to seek the record of it in Genesis ii. 2. At any rate the division by weeks was known in the patriarchal age: we find it, in fact, as early as the

history of the Flood, and we have a proof of its symbolical or religious meaning in its connexion with the marriage festival, chap. xxix. 27, 28, and also with the rite of circumcision, chap. xvii. 12. Hence it is not in itself an improbable thing, that there may have been some kind of festival connected with the seventh day, as early as the days of the patriarchs." He concludes, however, with this candid admission: "At the same time, it must be confessed that we cannot bring any proof of the existence of a Sabbatic festival in the ante-Sinaitic period. Neither the Divine determination in Gen. ii. 3, to sanctify the seventh day, nor the peculiar form in which this is first enjoined in the law, '*remember* the seventh day to keep it holy,' nor the event which prepared the way for the legal proclamation of the Sabbath, viz. the fact that no manna fell upon the seventh day, (Exod. xvi. 22 sqq.), can be appealed to as yielding decisive testimony in the affirmative. But on the other hand, we cannot quote these passages as proofs to the contrary, as *Hengstenberg* has done.—*The Lord's Day*, p. 7 sqq. (Martin's translation)."

Various statements in this passage seem questionable; as for instance that with regard to an hebdomadal division being the earliest that was known, and that which involves an interpretation of a passage in Philo. But, as the former of these has been discussed earlier in this Lecture, and the latter has been generally controverted by Selden, it is not worth while to enter upon them here.

Page 150, *line* 27. 'A sign .... between God and His people.' See Exod. xxxi. 13—17; xxxv. 1—3; Lev. xix. 3, 30; Isaiah lvi. 2, 4; lviii. 14; Ezek. xx. 12, 13, 20; xxii. 8, 26; xxiii. 38; xliv. 24; Nehem. ix. 14; xiii. 18.

Page 151, *line* 17. 'He fainteth not,' &c. Isaiah xl. 28.

Page 151, *line* 20. 'Was refreshed.' Exod. xxxi. 17.

Page 152, *line* 28. 'The peculiarity of their climate.' Michaëlis, "Comm. on Laws of Moses," Art. 195, notices that the *rest* was to be observed "in seed-time and in harvest," and considers that the climate of Palestine was such as to be favorable to keeping this command. This he confirms by the exceptional case mentioned in 1 Sam. xii. 17, and compares Jeremiah v. 24, "Neither say they in their heart, Let us now fear the Lord our God, that giveth rain, both the former and the latter,

in his season: He reserveth unto us the appointed weeks of the harvest." See also Leviticus xxvi. 4.

Page 153, *line* 4. 'For subsistence in the seventh year,' &c. It is not quite clear how the Israelites were provided for in the seventh-year Sabbath. At first sight the statement in the text of the Lecture seems at variance with what is said in Levit. xxv. 5, "That which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest shalt thou not reap," &c. But then verse 6 of the same chapter says, "The sabbath of the land," *i. e.* what the Sabbatical year produced spontaneously, "shall be meat for you," &c. Hence, especially on comparing the double supply of manna on the sixth day, and the express promise connected with the seven-times-seven-year Sabbath, it has been conjectured, either that sufficient produce grew on the sixth year to last through the seventh; or that the expression in verse 5 only took away such peculiarity of ownership as is implied in sowing, pruning, and gathering in, every one being allowed free range to supply himself with food wherever he pleased. Jennings has discussed the question in his "Jewish Antiquities," B. III. c. ix. vol. ii.

Page 153, *line* 9. 'The wilful breaker.' Exod. xxxi. 15; xxxv. 2; Numbers xv. 32—36.

Page 153, *line* 10. 'And if a national neglect.' Lev. xxvi. 34, 35, 43; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.

Page 154, *line* 12. 'Deuteronomy.' v. 12.

Page 154, *line* 20. 'Bishop Warburton.' "Divine Legation." B. IV. p. 203, note R R R R.

Page 155, *line* 12. 'Surely not total inactivity, ἀργία in the worst sense of the word.'.

Jennings, "Jewish Antiquities," p. 158, says that Le Clerc contends for the opinion that the Sabbath consisted only in cessation from work, (quoting Jer. xvii. 22, 24,) and fancies that the 'holy convocation' means merely what the Greeks call πανήγυρις, an assembly for feasting and pleasure. (Clerici Comm. in Exod. xx. 8.) Vitringa espouses the same sentiment. (De Synag. vet. lib. i. part ii. c. ii. especially pp. 289—294.) "The Jewish Doctors," continues Jennings, "are of a contrary opinion: they make the sanctification of the Sabbath to consist not merely in rest and idleness, but in meditation on the wonderful works of God, in the study of the law, and in instruction of those who are under them."

Spencer, de Leg. Hebr. Book I. c. v. § 8—10, was, says Hengstenberg, the originator of the opinion that the Sabbath enjoined an absolute *ἀργία*. Vitringa, he adds, adopted it and refers to Spencer. (See Hengst. pp. 13, 67, Martin's transl.) Michaëlis (Commentary on Laws of Moses, Art. 195) condemns it strongly. It is, however, much older; in Chrysostom, Hom. xxxix. on St. Matthew, we read: *εἰ εἶπε, τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ πράττετε ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ, τὰ δὲ κακὰ μὴ ποιεῖτε, οὐκ ἂν ἠνέσχοντο· ἁπάντων ὁμοίως ἀπεῖργε. μηδὲν γὰρ ποιήσητε, φησί. καὶ οὐδὲ οὕτως κατείχοντο.—κ.τ.λ.* In other words, that Father supposes that the Jews were commanded to do nothing at all, because they were likely to do evil if allowed to do anything. And yet, he confesses, they were not even thus kept within bounds.

Very recently, Dr. Reichel has maintained that "the Jewish Sabbath was simply a day of bodily inaction." ("The Lord's Day *not* the Sabbath," pref. p. xii. note. Dublin, 1859.)

Page 155, *line* 23, &c. 'They were to do no servile work, &c.' I think it most reasonable to consider the permission "to prepare what every man must eat," as a relaxation of the prohibitions of "doing servile work" and of "kindling a fire," on the Sabbath Day. They have, I know, been taken separately and applied to days of different degrees of obligation. For these points and those which follow, see Exod. xii. 16; Exod. xxxv. 2, 3; Isaiah lviii. 13; Nehem. x. 31, xiii. 15, 16, 18, 19, 21.

Page 156, *line* 2. 'The Day of Atonement.' Leviticus xxiii. 27.

Page 156, *line* 9. 'It was marked publicly by double sacrifices.' Numbers xxviii. 9. 'By the change of the shew-bread.' Leviticus xxiv. 8. 'By the receiving of instruction.' Deut. xxxiii. 10; Lev. x. 11; Deut. xxxi. 11, 12; 2 Kings iv. 23. Compare Acts xv. 21, "Moses is read in the Synagogues *ἀπὸ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων*"—and Acts xiii. 15, 27.

Page 156, *line* 18. 'It was further marked by . . . convocations.' Leviticus xxiii. 3; Isaiah iv. 5. Convocations took place on other days than the actual seventh: see Exod. xii. 16.

Page 156, *line* 21. 'Singing praises to God.' Ps. xcii, title. The contents of the Psalm seem to point to meditation on God's works.

Page 157, *line* 3. 'Gathered not from the Fourth Commandment merely.'

Jer. Taylor says :—

"There is nothing more reasonable, than that the commentaries or additional explications of their own prophets and holy men, and the usages of their nation, be taken into the sacredness of the text and the limits of the commandment."—*Duct. Dub.* vol. xii. p. 358.

Page 157, *line* 29. 'What Philo says.' Ἔθος γὰρ ἦν, ἀεὶ μὲν κατὰ τὸ παρεῖκον, προηγουμένως δὲ ταῖς ἑβδόμαις, ὡς ἐδήλωσα καὶ πρόσθεν, φιλοσοφεῖν· τοῦ μὲν ἡγεμόνος ὑφηγουμένου, καὶ διδάσκοντος ἅ τε χρὴ πράττειν καὶ λέγειν, τῶν δ' εἰς καλοκἀγαθίαν ἐπιδιδόντων, καὶ βελτιουμένων, τά τε ἤθη καὶ τὸν βίον. ἀφ' οὗ καὶ εἰσέτι νῦν φιλοσοφοῦσι ταῖς ἑβδόμαις Ἰουδαῖοι τὴν πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν, τὸν χρόνον ἐκεῖνον ἀναθέντες ἐπιστήμῃ, καὶ θεωρίᾳ τῶν περὶ φύσιν—τὰ γὰρ κατὰ πόλεις προσευκτήρια, τί ἕτερόν ἐστιν ἢ διδασκαλεῖα φρονήσεως;—*Philon. Opp.* p. 685. Paris, 1640. Compare also his book, "De Decalogo," p. 758.

See Bishop Jer. Taylor, "Duct. Dub." vol. xii. p. 425, and Thorndike, "on Relig. Assemblies," Works, vol. i. p. 3, Oxf. edit.

Page 158, *line* 4. 'For what are men,' &c. Tennyson, *Morte d'Arthur.* Compare Bp. Nicholson, *Expos. of the Catech.* Fourth Commandment; "Sanctification of the day by the exercise of religious duties [is necessary]: for to rest and not to sanctify, is to keep the Sabbath of an ox or an ass."

Cowper says something of the same sort in his *Retirement:*

"Absence of occupation is not at rest:
A mind quite vacant is a mind distressed."

Augustine, in speaking of the eternal Sabbath-keeping of the faithful (Epist. lv. c. 9,) says, "Inest autem in illâ requie non desidiosa segnitia, sed quædam ineffabilis tranquillitas actionis otiosæ. Sic enim ab hujus vitæ operibus in fine requiescitur, ut in alterius vitæ actione gaudeatur." Tom. ii. col. 178.

Page 159, *line* 11. 'In Josephus and in the Apocrypha.'

Agatharchides apud Joseph. Contr. Apion. lib. i. c. xxii. 1 Macc. ii. 38, 41. Compare Hooker, Eccl. Pol. V. 71. 8. For the policy of Pompey, see Josephus, Antiq. Jud. lib. xiv. c. 4, § 3.

Page 160, *line* 16. 'A Sabbath-day's journey.'

Michaëlis writes thus, "Commentary on Laws of Moses," Art. 195, vol. iii. p. 162, note: "Moses, in Exodus xvi. 29, commanded the Israelites thus: 'See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore He giveth you on the sixth day the

bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.' This meant that the Israelites were to stay at home on the Sabbath, and not go out, as on other days, to gather manna. Now the Rabbins, detaching the clause, 'abide ye every man in his place,' or, as it strictly means, 'sit every one in his place,' from its connexion with the rest of the passage, insisted that it was a general prohibition against going out of the camp, and that when the Israelites were no longer in a camp, it held in like manner with respect to the city, out of which, of course, no one durst then go; but that as the space of 2,000 cubits round the city belonged thereto, if a person went only that distance from it, he did not go out of it: and his going thus far was lawful, and constituted what they called a Sabbath-day's journey." He refers also to Lightfoot's "Horæ Hebraicæ," on Acts i. 12. Selden discusses the subject, and the somewhat varying statements of Origen, Jerom, and others, respecting the exact distance.

The breaking in upon the supposed precept in any degree seems to have been allowed by the Rabbins because the Jews would have to attend "the holy convocation" at the tabernacle in the midst of the camp. The exact distance is said to have been suggested, partly by Joshua's appointing the space of 2,000 cubits between the ark and the people when they marched into Canaan, Josh. iii. 4; partly by 2,000 cubits being assigned for the suburbs of the cities of the Levites on every side, Numb. xxxv. 5. This, in all probability, was the distance from Mount Olivet to Jerusalem, it being said to be "a Sabbath-day's journey."—*Jennings, "Jewish Antiq."* vol. ii. p. 154.

Page 160, *line* 19. 'Things not to be done on that day.' The instances in the text of the Lecture are given by Jennings, vol. ii. p. 157. More may be seen in that place; in Bingham, Antiq. of Christ. Ch. book xx. c. ii. § 3; and in Bp. Jeremy Taylor, "Ductor Dub." vol. xii. p. 415. A very curious description of the Sabbath of the modern Jews is quoted in "Time and Faith," vol. i. p. 101, from a work called "The British Jews," by the Rev. John Mills.

Page 161, *line* 1. 'The Great Day of Atonement . . . a Sabbath.' Lev. xvi. 31.

Page 161, *line* 7. 'Tacitus.' Hist. v. c. 4, 5.

Page 161, *line* 17. 'Suetonius.' In Vitâ Octav. c. lxxvi.

Page 161, *line* 20. 'Justin.' Lib. xxxvi. c. ii. § 14.
Page 161, *line* 24. 'Juvenal.' Sat. xiv. 105.
Page 161, *line* 27. 'Martial.' Epigr. iv. 4.

"Quod siccæ redolet palus lacunæ,
Quod jejunia Sabbatariorum," &c.

'Persius.' Sat. v. 184. "Recutitaque Sabbata palles."
'Ovid.' Rem. Am. lib. i. 219.

"Nec te peregrina morentur
Sabbata."

'Petronius,' xxxv. 6. "Et non jejunâ Sabbata lege premet."
Page 161, *line* penult. 'The Sabbath was made,' &c.; Mark ii. 27. I have purposely omitted to make references to the numerous places where the Sabbath is touched upon in our Lord's history, considering them to be familiar to all.
Page 162, *line* 10. 'My Father worketh,' &c. John v. 17.
Page 162, *line* 14. 'Dean Trench.' "On Miracles." The healing at Bethesda, p. 257.
Page 163, *line* 6. 'Stier.' On John v. 17. Braune and Herder are quoted by him.
Page 163, *line* 11. 'Bengel.' Gnomon N. T. in Joan. v. 17.
Page 164, *line* 8. 'The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath.' Mark ii. 28; Luke vi. 5.
Page 166, *line* 22. 'The law of the Sabbath fulfilled by Christ.' Abp. Whately seems to think that Christ broke the law of the Sabbath by desiring the impotent man at Bethesda to take up his bed, in contravention of what is at first sight apparently enjoined by Jeremiah (xvii. 22, 24), and enforced by Nehemiah (xiii. 19). But surely He did no more than show His contempt for the Pharisaical gloss upon those passages, which, though originally intended to prevent operations of business, had been strained to apply to such trivial and domestic matters as these. See "Thoughts on the Sabbath," pp. 15, 16. In John v. 1, the miracle at Bethesda is said to have taken place simply on an ἑορτή; but in verse 9 it appears that ἦν σάββατον ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.
Page 167, *line* 10. 'The Jewish . . . system by no means evangelical.'
Compare Cecil's "Remains," p. 301.

"The old dispensation was a dispensation of limits, way-marks, forms, and fashions: everything was weighed and measured. If a man did but gather sticks upon the Sabbath, he was to be stoned without mercy. If a Jew brought an offering, it was of no avail if not presented at the door of the tabernacle. The manner, the time, the circumstances, were all minutely instituted; and no devotion or piety of spirit could exempt a man from the yoke of all these observances, for God had appointed these as the way in which He chose that a devout Jew should express his state of mind."

Of the punishment of the man who was gathering sticks on the Sabbath Day, Chrysostom says, "He was put to death, *ὡς ἀδικήσας ἐν τύπῳ τὴν ἀλήθειαν*" (in Joan.).

Page 168, *line* 11. 'The Apostles, after the Resurrection.'

Compare Bengel on Col. ii. 16. "Non obscurè Christus, postquam ipse, Sabbati Dominus, venerat, vel ante passionem docuerat libertatem Sabbati: apertius verò, post resurrectionem, per Paulum eam asseruit."

LECTURE V.

Page 173, *line* 6. 'So is the continuance of the new-moon Festival.' Bengel on Coloss. ii. 16, says, "Sabbatum est typus rerum etiam æternarum, (Heb. iv. 3, seq.) nec tamen ideo in N. T. durat: alias etiam Novilunia forent retinenda. (Is. lxvi. 22, 23.)

Page 173, *line* 19. 'Ezekiel xlvi. 3, 4.'

"Likewise the people of the Lord shall worship at the door of this gate before the Lord, in the Sabbaths and in the new moons. And the burnt offerings that the prince shall offer unto the Lord in the Sabbath day shall be six lambs without blemish, and a ram without blemish."

Page 173, *line* 24. 'Pray that your flight,' &c.

Compare Chrysostom on St. Matt. xxiv. 20 (tom vii. p. 732).

Ὁρᾷς ὅτι πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ὁ λόγος αὐτῷ, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐκείνους καταληψομένων κακῶν διαλέγεται; οὐ γὰρ δὴ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἔμελλον σάββατον τηρεῖν, ἢ ἐκεῖ ἔσεσθαι, ἡνίκα Οὐεσπασιανὸς ταῦτα ἔπραξε, καὶ γὰρ ἔφθασαν προαπελθόντες οἱ πλείους· εἰ δέ τις ἀπελείφθη, ἐν ἄλλοις τῆς οἰκουμένης διέτριβε μέρεσι τότε. διὰ τί δὲ, μὴ χειμῶνος, μηδὲ σαββάτου; χειμῶνος μὲν, διὰ τὴν δυσκολίαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ καιροῦ· σαββάτου δὲ, διὰ τὴν αὐθεντίαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ φυγῆς χρεία καὶ φυγῆς ταχίστης, οὔτε δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ Ἰουδαῖοι τότε φεύγειν ἐτόλμων διὰ τὸν νόμον· οὔτε δὲ ἐν χειμῶνι τὸ τοιοῦτον εὔκολον ἦν, διὰ τοῦτο προσεύχεσθέ φησιν. ἔσται γὰρ τότε θλῖψις, κ.τ.λ.

Then he goes on to refer his hearers to Josephus, as an unquestionable witness of the tragic scenes that occurred.

Hengstenberg observes very well, that if "Pray that your flight be not on the Sabbath Day," is to be taken as in favor of Sabbatical observance, "the Saviour is but helping to build up, what He always aimed to overthrow, the scruples of the Pharisees with regard to the outward observance of the Sabbath."—*On the Lord's Day* (Martin's trans.), p. 106.

Page 174, *line* 22. 'Non monstrare,' &c. Juvenal xiv. 104.

Page 175, *line* 16. 'I have only quoted these passages;' &c.

The text from Matt. xxiv. 20, was actually brought forward by Brabourne in support of his Saturday-Sabbatarian view, and

Bishop Francis White, (*Treatise, &c.* p. 124, seq.), takes the trouble to refute him. The latter quotes very appositely the following passage from Abulensis, (q. 121 in Matt. xxiv.).

"Sabbatum obstabat ad fugiendum, non quasi conversi ad Christum putarent esse peccatum; quia, etiamsi putarent manere obligationem legis, sicut in lege Mosis, non erat peccatum fugere in tali necessitate: tamen licet constaret de hâc necessitate credentibus, non constabat Judæis inter quos vivebant credentes, nesciebant enim talia pericula instare, et ideo putarent eos violatores Sabbati, quasi sine causâ itinerantes, et sic lapidarent eos."

The employment of Matt. xxiv. 20, to support the Sunday-Sabbatarian view is not uncommon in the present day.

Page 178, *line* 5. 'Now it is said very confidently.'

"Notice, (says Dean Alford on Gal. iv. 10), how utterly such a verse is at variance with any and every theory of a Christian Sabbath, cutting at the root, as it does, of all obligatory observance of times as such: see notes on Rom. xiv. 5, 6, Col. ii. 16." On these passages, particularly on the former, he speaks yet more strongly, against the doctrine that the observance of any day is of obligation under Christianity, as Scriptural and Apostolical, and so Divine. "If any one day in the week were invested with the sacred character of the Sabbath, it would have been wholly impossible for the Apostle to commend or uphold the man who judged all days worthy of equal honour—who, as in verse 6, paid no regard to the (any) day. He must have visited him with his strongest disapprobation, as violating a command of God. I therefore infer, that Sabbatical obligation to keep any day, whether seventh or first, was not required in Apostolic times." Then he goes on to enunciate his own view, which is what I have called the purely Ecclesiastical one. "It must be carefully remembered that this inference does not concern the question of the observance of the Lord's Day as an institution of the Christian Church, analogous to the Sabbath, binding on us from considerations of humanity and religious expediency, and by the rules of that branch of the Church in which Providence has placed us, but not in any way inheriting the divinely appointed obligation of the other, or the strict prohibitions by which its sanctity was defended." Thus far Dean Alford. I have given my reasons for disagreeing with him, in various parts

of these Lectures. I wish to state here, that though the Ecclesiastical view seems to me logically to conduct those who hold it to the results which I mention, I believe that men in general stop short of those results. And so in reference to those who are in the other extreme. Though I believe that the Sabbatarian view of the origin and obligation of Sunday should make a man, in consistency, keep his Sabbath on Saturday, and with such strictness as the Mosaic command, interpreted by other parts of the Old Testament, would appear to prescribe, and also observe the things which St. Paul calls a σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, I do not believe that many see to what their principles naturally lead them.

Page 178, *line* 28. 'Must have their counterparts,' &c.

Mr. Newman contends that they have; but the objection to his argument is, that it is founded solely upon analogy, and not upon the belief of the ancient Church. See his "Sermons on Subjects of the Day," Sermon XV.

Page 179, *line* 10. 'The passage in the Romans.'

Of course I am perfectly aware of the controversy which has been raised respecting both the genuineness and the interpretation of Romans xiv. 5, 6.

In the former verse the rendering of our Version has been questioned, and it has been asserted that κρίνει ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν, κ.τ.λ. cannot bear the sense of "one man judgeth one day above another, another judgeth every day alike," for παρὰ cannot be so translated. I am inclined, however, to think that our version is correct, and that the passage in Soph. Ajax, 475, quoted by Burton, and the use of παρὰ in 1 Cor. iii. 11, confirms the use of this preposition to denote preference to or comparison with. (See Dr. Stanley on 1 Cor. iii. 11).

Mr. Jowett, connecting κρίνει, κ.τ.λ. with what has preceded and what follows about meats, supposes the passage should be translated thus: "One man approves (selects or distinguishes) alternate days; another, every day." Hermann, on the passage in Sophocles, mentioned above, and H. Stephanus, (quoted by Hermann), translate παρὰ thus, "alternis diebus;" but by what necessity I cannot discover. Jelf, Gr. Gr. § 637, seems to agree with them. But Mr. Jowett observes, that it is not quite certain whether Judaism is alluded to at all here. If it is not, the number of passages which I have to examine is so far diminished; but

I have thought it best, on the whole, to adopt the rendering of the Authorized Version. Dean Alford takes no notice of the difficulty of the preposition.

In verse 6 the genuineness of the second clause, "He that regardeth not the day," &c. has been disputed. The "Five Clergymen," who have recently issued a translation of the Epistle, abandon it. Dean Alford, (one of them), retains it in the text, though he places it in brackets, and observes, that it may have been omitted from the similarity of ending having misled early copyists; but he adds, (in accordance with his purely Ecclesiastical theory of the Lord's Day), "It may have been intentionally omitted after the observation of the Lord's Day came to be regarded as binding." Mr. Jowett omits it. Of course, if it is spurious, the whole structure of Mr. F. W. Robertson's ingenious, but, I think, dangerous sermon, "The Sydenham Palace, and the Religious non-Observance of the Sabbath," falls to the ground. I believe myself that it is thoroughly genuine, and that an antithesis is required here, as in the next clause. And the paraphrase that I give in the text of the Lecture seems to me to render the adoption of Mr. Robertson's interpretation unnecessary. I mention his Sermon again in Lecture V. pp. 191, 192. It is to be found in his "Second Series," Serm. xiv. Though objectionable in some respects, it contains a noble protest against the enforcement on the poor, of a rigorous observance of the Lord's Day from which the rich exempt themselves. So, indeed, does his other sermon on the subject, "First Series," Serm. vi. But see Lecture VIII. p. 333.

Page 180, *line* 21. 'In all this,' &c.

It is not for a moment contended that St. Paul's principle as to charitable allowance of each other, in doing or abstaining from things indifferent, is not applicable to the conduct of Christians. It is very applicable, and bye and bye I shall exhibit an application of it to the enjoyments and employments of the Lord's Day. What I contend is, that the Lord's Day is not itself among the things indifferent, but an institution of Scriptural obligation.

Page 183, *line* 23. 'To have especial times for religion argues,' &c.

Mr. Baden Powell, "Christianity without Judaism." Essay III. c. vii. p. 187.

"Of all corrupt notions, that of relegating religious duties to certain periods or days is one of the most grateful to human nature, but most radically hostile to Christian principles, though often defended upon the plea, that what is left to be done at any time will never be done; whereas the true argument is, that it is to be done at all times."

Page 184, *line* 29. 'When did the reverence for it spring up.'

Thorndike, "Laws of the Church," III. 21, 20, says: "Of this original and universal custom [of observing the Lord's Day] having as yet found no question made on any side, I hold it superfluous to make evidence of that which no man questions." His Oxford annotator remarks, "Heylin must be noted as an exception to this general rule, he being carried so far by zeal against the Sabbatarians as to maintain, (Hist. of Sabbath, Part II. c. iii. §. 1), that the observation of the Lord's Day began in the Church as a fixed and universal law not earlier than the time and law of Constantine the Great. To whom may be added the Magdeburg Centuriators, Hist. Eccl. Cent. i. lib. ii. c. 6; De Ceremoniis, p. 493; and De Festis, p. 503; and Cent. ii. c. vi. p. 119."

Compare Baxter, "Divine Appt." &c. p. 49.

"So that when 1, Christian history, 2, and heathen, acquaint us with the matter of fact, that the day was kept in the Apostles' time; 3, yea, when no hereticks or sects of Christians are found contradicting it, but the Churches then and after universally practised it without any controversy; what fuller historical evidence can there be?

"And to say that, 1, the Apostles would not have reproved this, if it had not been their own doing; 2, or that it could be done, and they not know it; 3, and that all Christians who acknowledge their authority would have consented in such a practice superstitiously before their faces, and against their wills, and no testimony be left us of one faithful Church or Christian that contradicted it, and stuck to the Apostolical authority, even where the Churches received their writings, and publickly read them; all this is such as is not by sober Christians to be believed."

Page 187, *line* 17. 'St. Paul,' &c. Compare Olshausen on Rom. xiv. 5, 6.

"In the words κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν is expressed the *original Apostolic* view, which did not distinguish particular festivals, because to it the whole Christian life had become one festival. As, however, the season of the Church's prime passed away, the necessity could not but at the same time have again made itself felt, of giving prominence to points of festival light in the general current of every-day life."

It is obvious that, if Olshausen's remark is correct, either the Apostles themselves altered their view, and so acknowledged themselves to be mistaken, or the Church after them altered their practice, and that so, in observing the Sunday, we have un-Apostolic Christianity.

Page 189, *line* 2. 'Having been established originally,' &c. On this, see Dr. T. Young, "Dies Dominica," Prooem. p. ii. :—

"Hi audacter potius, quam vere, hujus temporis auctoritatem, non Dei, sed hominum constitutioni acceptam ferunt; quasi Dominica solennitas esset instar Feriarum quæ erant Romanis imperativæ, scilicet, quas Prætores pro arbitrio potestatis indicebant, atque ita ejus observatio a civilis Magistratûs, et Ecclesiæ auctoritate penderet."

Page 189, *line* 17. 'A change of the day.'

It is curious that Mr. Holden, "The Christian Sabbath," p. 273, Lond. 1825, though he sees the *peculiar fitness* of the first day of the week, does not see it in the light of an imperative duty. "Forcibly (he says) as this day is recommended to our adoption, I cannot perceive it to be unalterable," &c. This was a natural result of his theory that "one day in seven" is the essence of the Fourth Commandment, and that it is as well obeyed by keeping the First as by keeping the Seventh Day. If so, as the day has been changed once, it may be changed again. He cannot, in candour, avoid this conclusion; and he is driven to the same sort of reservations and qualifications as Suarez, and Bp. Sanderson, and Dr. Heylin, and Abp. Whately have adopted.

On the subject of change of the day, Dr. Whewell, "El. of Morality," &c. B. IV. c. xvi. p. 122, remarks,—

"In points on which the evidence of Apostolic and Catholic usage is complete, a Christian, or a body of Christians, have no liberty to alter the mode of observance. As an example of this, it appears to be inconsistent with Christian duty for any com-

munity to alter the day of religious observances from the first to any other day of the week; as Calvin is said to have suggested to the city of Geneva to do, in order that they might show their Christian liberty in regard to ordinances. If to do this were within the limits of Christian liberty, it would likewise be so to alter the period of the recurrence of the day, and to observe every fifth day, or every tenth, as was appointed in France when Christianity was rejected."

Page 189, *line* 19. 'Calvin . . . proposed to the magistrates of Geneva.'

"Whereupon it was sadly demurred upon, even in Geneva, to have that day altered to Thursday; and himself (Calvin) holds it alterable."—*Dr. John Pocklington, "Sunday no Sabbath,"* p. 8. London, 1636. He refers to Barclay's Paræn. lib. i. c. xiii. p. 160.

Page 189, *line* 20. 'Dr. Heylin.' "Hist. of Sabb." Part II. c. vi. § 2.

Page 189, *line* 22. 'Suarez.' Lib. ii. "De Relig." c. i.

Page 189, *line* 24. 'Bishop Sanderson.' In his "Opinion upon certain Cases," &c. Answer to the Second Question.

Page 189, *line* 29. 'Archbishop Whately.' "Thoughts," &c. p. 18.

Page 190, *line* 17. 'Our theory precludes any such result.' The following is an extract from Bishop Cosin's "Determination on the Immutable Obligation of the Lord's Day," at Cambridge, 1640. It is of the nature of a reply to Dr. Heylin's "Hist. of the Sabbath." It will be observed that the Bishop makes use of the argument that the Lord's Day has no traceable origin in Ecclesiastical Councils. "Denique, ipsa quoque omnium sæculorum experientia sententiæ nostræ veritatem confirmat, quum Ecclesia Christiana in nullis Conciliis et Synodis vel Diem hunc primum instituerit, vel instituti mutationem Diei unquam attentaverit; neque unquam futurum sit ut sine maximo Christianorum scandalo eum quoquomodo attentet, quia nulla causa aut occasio singularis cogitari potest, quæ Diem hunc memoriæ resurrectionis Domini et sanctissimis usibus dicatum mutabilem reddat: contrà de aliis legibus ad tempus tantum institutis censendum est, harum enim cum causa mutata sit, ipsæ etiam leges mutari possint, et soleant; at in hâc nostrâ, causa perpetua et sempiterna erit, nec convelli aut loco suo moveri queat. Nec quicquam valet illud a Suarezio suggestum; 'mutari scilicet hunc Diem

posse in alium per auctoritatem Ecclesiæ absolutam, non verò practicam :' non minus enim valuisset hæc distinctio in Sabbatum olim Judæorum, quam in nostrum quadrat Dominicum, quum in neutro erat aliquid intrinsecum quod hujus vel illius mutationem vetuit, sed externum tantum Dei mandatum. Est vero lex divina positiva, nulla autem realis sanctitas, quæ vel Sabbatum Hebraicum vel Dominicum Christianum à quovis alio die dispescuit. Aio igitur, quod stante lege Evangelicâ non magis in nobis sita est potestas mutandi Dominicum, quam in Judæis olim erat transferendi Sabbatum stante lege Mosaicâ."

Page 191, *line* ult. 'Mr. F. W. Robertson.' *Ut suprà.* I believe that much of the confusion of thought, which appears in the two Sermons of Mr. Robertson above quoted, arises from this: that though he spends a good deal of time in proving that the Sabbath and the Lord's Day are distinct institutions, he afterwards forgets that he has done so; and applying to the Lord's Day what is said in the New Testament as to the indifferent character of the Sabbath, in effect makes them the same.

Page 192, *line* 29. 'Hengstenberg.' "The Lord's Day," p. 93 (Martin's translation).

Page 193, *line* 4. 'Every day is a Sabbath to the Christian,' &c.

It is curious that Philo (de Sept. §§ 2—5), puts *first* in his list of *ten* Jewish ἑορταὶ, "*Every day.*" πρώτη μὲν, ἣν ἀκούσας θαυμάσαι τις ἂν ἴσως. Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡμέρα πᾶσα. The second is the seventh-day Sabbath. In § 6, Philo speaks of the employments of the Sabbath; in § 7, of kindling fire, &c.

Page 193, *line* 12. 'The false spiritualism,' &c.

Dr. Chalmers, "Congregational Sermons," vol. ii. Sermon xiv. on "The Advantages of a Fixed Sabbath," pp. 304, seq., has some admirable remarks on the importance of regularly recurring times for religious duties. His text is, Gal. iv. 10.

Page 194, *line* 16. 'In order to keep every day,' &c.

Pridden, "Early Christians," p. 120, translates thus from Fleury. His language may, *mutatis mutandis*, be urged in favor of a fixed Lord's Day.

"Although it is true that the Christian religion is altogether inward and spiritual, yet Christians are men as well as others, and therefore not above the power of sense and imagination. Devotion must therefore be assisted by the impressions of sense.

Were we angels, we might pray in all places alike—in the hurry of the roads, in the crowd of the streets, in the noise of the guard-chamber, or in the confusion and riot of a tavern. Why, then, do we shun these places of distraction, and when we would be devout, seek after silence and retirement, but only as a remedy against the weakness of sense and imagination? It is not *God* that hath need of temples and places of prayer, but *we*. He is equally present in all places, and always alike ready to hear us everywhere, but we are not always in a frame of mind fit to address Him." Hence, &c. &c.

Page 196, *line* ult. 'Had the Sabbath received its full antitype in Canaan,' &c. It indeed received a partial antitype in this way, for David says elsewhere, 1 Chron. xxiii. 25, "The Lord God of Israel hath given rest unto His people, that they may dwell in Jerusalem (*or, as it is in the margin,* and He dwelleth in Jerusalem) for ever."

Page 197, *line* 9. 'If the true Joshua,' Heb. iv. 10. Dean Alford says upon this verse, "that Owen, Alting, Stark, and recently Ebrard, refer ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν to Christ. 'For He who entered into His (own or God's) rest, Himself also rested from His works, like as God rested from His own; and, therefore, from our Forerunner having entered into this Sabbatism, it is reserved for us, the people of God, to enter into it, and because of Him.' 'Thus,' as Ebrard says, 'Jesus is placed in the liveliest contrast to Joshua, who had not brought God's people to their rest, and is designated as "That one who entered into God's rest."'"

Page 197, *line* 20. 'No longer to be called κατάπανσις.'

"Σαββατισμὸς est haud dubie idem, quod antea sæpius κατάπανσις dicitur. Sed maluit Auctor hîc σαββατισμῷ uti, quod legentis animum ad ea revocaret, quæ suprà de Deo, septimo die quiescente, dixisset, simul que doceret, esse in Sabbato *typum* sîve adumbrationem cœlestis vitæ, quæ et ipsa perpetuum Sabbatum est habitura."—*Abresch. not. in Heb.* iv.

"Non dixit *quietem* sed Sabbatismum, nomine propriè explicato, et eo quidem quo maximè oblectabat. Eo item nomine usus est Apostolus, ut revocaret ab externâ observatione Sabbati observationem. Neque enim aliter potest ejus abrogatio intelligi, quam cognito spirituali fine quem proximè attingit."—*Calvin, in Heb.* iv.

Page 198, *line* 15. 'If we make it identical,' &c.

Morer, Ἡμέρα Κυριακή, p. 87, puts the argument another way. "The Sabbath is a shadow of things to come, viz. of Christ, 'the body;' if, therefore, we assert that the Sabbath continues now, we deny that Christ has come."

Page 203, *line* 24. 'They are binding upon us *because*.' Something has been said upon the points here involved in a note to Lecture IV. p. 143, l. 24. The following may be added.

1. Dr. Whewell, "Elements of Morality," &c. says, B. III. c. xvi.:—"The Ten Commandments are not binding upon Christians because they are parts of the law of Moses, but because they are parts of the moral law. *Thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery;* are precepts which do not derive their authority from any special command, but from the moral nature God has given to man. There are parts of the Ten Commandments which are merely arbitrary, or local, or temporary, and apply only to the ancient Jews. Such is the reason given in the fifth command, *that thy days*, &c.; such is the command of absolute abstinence from labour on the Sabbath; such is the selection of the seventh day of the week for the day of rest, if that selection is really included in the command."

2. Abp. Whately's Essay "On the Abolition of the Law," the fifth in his Second Series, is a valuable treatise on this part of my subject. I can, however, only quote a few words from § 2: "The very law itself indicates, on the face of it, that the whole of its precepts were intended for the Israelites exclusively, (on which supposition they cannot of course be, by their own authority, binding on Christians), not only from the intermixture of civil and ceremonial precepts with moral, but from the very terms in which even these last are delivered. For instance, there cannot be any duties more clearly of universal obligation than that of the worship of the one true God alone, and that of honoring parents; yet the precepts for both of these are so delivered as to address them to the children of Israel exclusively: 'I am the Lord thy God, who *brought thee out of the land of Egypt*, out of the house of bondage; thou shalt have none other Gods but Me.' And again, 'Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy *days may be long* in the *land which the Lord thy God giveth thee*.'

"The simplest and clearest way, then, of stating the case with respect to the present question, is, to lay down, on the one hand, that the Mosaic law was limited both to the nation of the Israelites and to the period before the Gospel; but, on the other hand, that the natural principles of morality, which, (among other things), it inculcates, are, from their own character, of universal obligation; that, as on the one hand 'no Christian man (as our article expresses it) is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral;' so, on the other hand, it is not *because* they are commandments of the Mosaic law that he is bound to obey them, but because they *are* moral. Indeed there are numerous precepts in the laws, for instance, of Solon and Mahomet, from a conformity to which no Christian can pretend exemption: yet, though we are bound to practise almsgiving and several other duties there enjoined, and to abstain from murder, for instance, and false witness, which these lawgivers forbid, no one would say that a part of the Koran is binding on Christians, since their conduct is determined, not by the authority of the Koran, but by the nature of the case."

3. Dr. Heurtley says, "Univ. Serm. on the Lord's Day," pp. 17, 18, that the moral law did not become obligatory for the first time when it was promulgated at Sinai, nor upon any except the Jews *because* of its being promulgated there. It had been obligatory upon all men from the beginning of the world, though its obligations had been grievously lost sight of and forgotten." Dr. Heurtley's view of the subject generally does not agree with my own, any more than that of Dr. Whewell, or of Abp. Whately does, but I quote him merely for the point in question.

Page 203, *line* 28. 'That opinion of Calvin seems to be a probable one,' &c.

Calvin's view is perspicuously stated by Hengstenberg, ("The Lord's Day," pp. 81, 82,) though I conceive he is scarcely justified in attributing the assertion which he is controverting to "English Theologians," at least in such a sense as to make it a dogmatic statement of the English Church. He asks the questions, "*What is the Decalogue? and in what relation does it stand to the other laws of the Old Testament?*" and he then makes "English Theologians" reply,—"The Decalogue differs entirely from the other laws of Moses. It contains the purely moral law, and is binding upon all men and all times. For the

rest of the law was written by Moses in a book; the Decalogue was first proclaimed by the voice of God, amidst fearful natural phenomena, which called attention to its importance, and then written by the finger of God upon tables of stone, the symbol of perpetuity." These statements I cannot discover to have been anywhere made by *the English Church*, though something very like them is found in Hooker, whom Hengstenberg had probably in view. [See Lecture IV. p. 144, for some remarks upon them.] In opposition to them, Hengstenberg makes the following statement, which will be found to be much in accordance with what I have said in the text of this Lecture: "The Decalogue contains the kernel and quintessence of the whole code of laws of the Old Testament. It was important that immediately after the covenant was concluded, the chief points in the arrangements of the new house should be sketched in rough lines upon the door-post. The Decalogue is the sketch of all the legislation that follows; and this is the filling up of the former—so that Calvin has adopted a correct method, when he adds to every commandment all that belongs to it throughout the Pentateuch. Thus he appends to the Sabbath command not only all that occurs with direct reference to the Sabbath, but all that relates to the Sabbatic year, the year of jubilee, and the festivals. From this view alone, that the Decalogue contained the quintessence of the whole of the Mosaic laws, is the appropriateness of the symbol of the stone tables made sufficiently apparent, and the frequent allusions made to the Ten Commandments by Christ and the Apostles under the simple name of *the* commandments, explained. For if they were indeed the most important part of the Old Testament legislation, it follows that the kernel in them must be of greater worth than the shell—the eternal than that which was merely temporary; though it by no means follows that there was no shell at all in them, that no special ends were to be answered, and that they had no exclusive reference to the people to whom they were first given. On the contrary, there are several proofs that such a special purpose did exist; that the Ten Commandments are not to be applied in this unhesitating manner to the Christian Church; and that, in fact, regarded as *laws*, they are no more applicable to it than the rest of the Pentateuch. The words with which they are introduced, 'I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of Egypt, out of

the house of bondage,' are sufficient in themselves to prove this. These words establish the right of God to give the law, and the duty of Israel to obey it. This right is claimed by God, not on the ground of His general relation to the human race, but on that of the special relation into which He has entered to Israel. He has bought it at a great price from its former hard masters, the Egyptians, not that it may belong to itself, but that it may belong to Him. This *ground* of obligation does not affect us, and therefore the obligation itself does not."

Bp. Ironside, "Seven Questions of the Sabbath," speaks thus of Calvin's view: "The Sabbath being in the Decalogue, sacrifices and all other ceremonials were there also; for the Sabbath is there placed as the *summum genus*, and short epitome, of the whole ceremonial law, as Calvin hath well observed."

Page 204, *line* 17. 'The Sabbatarian spiritualises it in his peculiar way,' &c.

Compare Dean Alford's remark in his "Second Letter to Mr. Sperling," pp. 12, 13: "If I were disposed to turn the tables—which I am not, for I as little believe my Sabbatarian friends guilty of disingenuousness as they me—might I not fairly say, to which of the two does the charge more properly apply—to myself, who, regarding the commandment as not binding in its literal sense, read it as interpreted by the Gospel and the Church,—or to them, who, regarding it as strictly and literally obligatory on them, obey its command to observe *one prescribed day*, for a *definite assigned reason*, and in a *strictly specified manner*, by observing *another day*, for a *totally different reason*, and in a *manner entirely their own*;—first praying that they may keep the law, then abrogating every word of it, substituting a new law of their own, and investing it with the authority of the other."

Page 205, *line* 1. 'Other reasons which may have influenced our Reformers.'

The terms in which confession to the priest is spoken of in the first and second Books of King Edward the Sixth respectively, are very different. In the first it is considered the obvious and natural method of preparation for the Holy Communion; in the second it is only the resort suggested, in case a person cannot, after having tried, quiet his own conscience. Thorndike,

"Just Weights and Measures," c. xxii. (Works, vol. v. p. 245), observes, that "confession of sins (of course to the Almighty) afore the Eucharist is seen in some of the ancient liturgies;" and he adds, "I do not find it questioned on any hand, as either unseasonable, or not requisite in this action. The Decalogue, and answers, which, since Queen Elizabeth's time [this is an error; he should have said, since King Edward the Sixth's second Book], we begin the service with, seem more proper to be placed here, (*i.e.* just before the Confession), to branch forth the particulars of those sins which we confess. For the commandments are certain heads, to which men may refer the sins for which they ask pardon, and grace to avoid them." But though Thorndike has thus justified the insertion of the Ten Commandments in the Liturgy, he is not quite satisfied with it after all: and here I venture to disagree with him. He goes on thus: "There is great reason why they are not found in the service of the ancient Church. The reason is, because the Decalogue is proper to the law, and unproper to Christianity." His real objection, however, is that "the Sabbatarian error hath had the rise, or increase, from the construction, which ignorant preachers have made, of the prayer for remission of sins against this Fourth Commandment, which the Church prescribeth."

There is, I think, little doubt that a combination of motives influenced the Reformers in their insertion of the Ten Commandments in the Liturgy. The providing of convenient heads for self-examination was one, and a very wise one, so it seems to me. I cannot regret that they are there, even though their presence may have led to the abuse of which Thorndike speaks. It is possible that the offering of a protest against idolatry was another motive; that a desire to counteract the purely Ecclesiastical theory of the Lord's Day was a third; that the inculcation of loyalty by the words of the Fifth Commandment was a fourth; and that the guarding of morality generally against the communism of the Anabaptists was a fifth motive. It may also be that Valerandus Pollanus (or Pullain), and John a Lasco (or Laski), the former a refugee from Strasburg, and the latter a Polish noble, (both exiled in consequence of the *Interim*), may have suggested the idea of the insertion, by their liturgies. And no other authority except theirs, and a manual of one Gilbertus Cognatus, A.D. 1553, and the Primers of A.D. 1535

and 1545, may be adducible as similar cases. But, 1. Every national Church is surely at liberty to arrange her own Liturgy, and to derive hints for such arrangement from any available source; and, 2. All things considered, the advantages gained by the insertion more than counterbalance any supposed or contingent disadvantage. As for the question of ancient precedent, if any justification is necessary, it was a practice of antiquity to read a lesson from the Old Testament before proceeding to those from the New. Our own Church has adopted this plan in the Morning and Evening Service. The Liturgy is clearly a service distinct and complete in itself; and, as such, may follow the rule of the other services. Mr. Palmer has discussed this point, and excused the invariableness of this Old Testament lesson by several cases somewhat parallel. "Orig. Liturg." vol. ii. pp. 27–32. For the other points, see Procter "On the Book of Common Prayer," pp. 45–49, and p. 341; L'Estrange, "Alliance of Divine Offices," c. vi. p. 246, Oxford Edit.

Page 206, *line* 4. 'The Scotch and the American Liturgies.' The Scotch Liturgy, in the rubric before the Commandments, instead of the words, "for their transgression thereof for the time past," has, "for their transgression of every duty therein, either according to the letter or to the mystical importance of the said commandment, for the time past." The American Liturgy allows the alternative of using either the Decalogue, or the Evangelical Form in which our Lord sums up all religious and moral duty.

Page 206, *line* 15. 'It no more binds us,' &c. Compare the passage from Selden's "Table Talk," quoted in Lecture IV. p. 145; and in page 357 the paraphrase of the Response given in the extract from Dr. Hawkins' Bampton Lecture.

Page 206, *line* 22. 'It does not by including all Church Holydays,' &c. See Lecture I. pp. 11, 12, where a paraphrase of the Response is given according to Dr. Heylin's interpretation of it. This is also the acceptation of the commandment in the Tridentine and certain other authorized Catechisms of the Church of Rome.

Page 206, *line* 25. 'It does not so volatilize,' &c. The tendency of the neglect of the passages in Scripture which indicate the Lord's Day as an observance of the Apostles, while

those passages are dwelt upon exclusively which abrogate or spiritualize the Sabbath, is here hinted at.

Page 206, *line* penult. 'And lastly, it does not,' &c. The view is controverted by anticipation by Bishop Jer. Taylor. He says: "Upon the occasion of this, (Col. ii. 16, 17), and some other like expressions, the Christians have supposed that all the rites of Moses were types and figures of something in Christianity, and that some mystery of ours must correspond to some rite of theirs. This fancy makes some impertinences in the discourses of wise men, and amuses and entertains the understanding of many with little images of things which were never intended, and hath too often a very great influence with doctrines: whereas here the word σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, 'the shadow of things to come,' means a shadow in respect of the things to come: that is, if these rituals be compared to the τὰ μέλλοντα, 'those things which were to come,' they are but very shadows and nothings: σκιὰ or 'shadow' signifies not in relation, but in opposition to, 'corpus.' 'The shadow,' that is a religion consisting but in rituals and exterior solemnities; but Christianity is 'the body,' that is, that durable, permanent, true, and substantial religion which is fit for all men, and to abide for all ages."—*Ductor Dubit. Works*, vol. xii. p. 419.

Page 207, *line* ult. 'We may not argue with the Tridentine Catechism.' Vide Catech. Rom. Part III. cap. iv. de Tertio [Quarto] Precepto, Quæstt. 17, 18, 19. See also the Italian abridgment of it, noticed in Lecture II. p. 42, and especially, in Lecture VI. p. 253.

Page 210, *line* 8. 'Under Apostolic example.' Compare Thorndike, "Of the Laws of the Church," III. c. xxi. (Works, vol. iv. p. 499). "And I cautioned afore, that the resurrection of Christ was as sufficient a reason why the Church should serve God on the Sunday; as the creation of the world was, why the Synagogue should serve God on the Saturday. But this dependance was not immediate; because I shewed also, that this was not enough to introduce the obligation upon us. The act of the Apostles intervening was the means to make the obligation necessary and legal; whereof, before, the ground only was reasonable. But I do not mean this dependance to be the effect of the fourth commandment only, which prescribeth only bodily rest, as I have showed; but of those appendences of it, whereby

the assemblies of the Jews and their sacrifices for that day were enacted. For, because they were to serve God upon the Sabbath, it was certainly reasonable, in regard of our Lord's resurrection, that Christians should serve God upon the first day of the week."

Page 210, *line* 23. 'The Book of Homilies.' "Homily on the Time and Place of Prayer."

Page 211, *line* 24. 'Archbishop Bramhall.' "Disc. on the Sabb." &c. Works, vol. v. p. 70. Puller, "Moder. of the Church of England," p. 160, speaks of Archbishop Bramhall's comment on the Homily with entire approval.

Page 213, *line* 6. 'I rather hold,' &c. This is the substance of a remark by Dr. Stanley in his Essay on Apostolical Worship. See what he says on 1 Cor. xiv. 26—40.

Page 214, *line* ult. 'To where beyond,' &c. Tennyson, *Guinevere.*

LECTURE VI.

Page 217, *line* 3. 'They were too numerous for that.'

Compare Baxter, "The Divine Appt." &c. p. 150.

"The Devil hath here been a great *Undoer* by *Overdoing*. When he knew not how else to cast out the holy observation of the Lord's Day with zealous people, he found out the trick of devising so many days, called Holy Days, to set up by it, that the people might perceive that the observation of them all as holy was never to be expected. And so the Lord's Day was jumbled in the heap of Holy Days, and all turned into ceremony by the Papists, and too many other Churches in the world, which became Calvin's temptation, (as his own words make plain), to think too meanly of the Lord's Day with the rest."

Page 221, *line* 15. 'This was Brentzer's view.'

John Brentius, or Brentzer, was born in Suabia A.D. 1499, and educated at Heidelberg University. His doctrines coincided generally with those of Luther, who speaks highly of him as an expounder of Holy Scripture. ("Table-Talk," § 749, Hazlitt's Edit.). He died A.D. 1570. Bp. Prideaux, "De Sabbato," § 7, and Dr. Heylin, "History of the Sabbath," Part II. c. vi. p. 467, both mention his low view of the Lord's Day.

Page 221, *line* 20. 'It has been said,'—by the Rev. J. F. D. Maurice, Second "Sermon on the Sabbath," p. 41.

Page 222, *line* 14. 'Luther's "Table-Talk."' Quoted in the "Westminster Review" for Sept. 1856, p. 456.

Page 222, *line* 24. 'Baxter.' "The Divine Appt." &c. p. 127.

Page 223, *line* 11. 'The "Larger Catechism" of Luther.'

This document is quoted by Hengstenberg, "The Lord's Day," p. 62 (Martin's transl.); but I have consulted the original, and made various alterations in the rendering.

Page 225, *line* 4. 'The . . . Confession . . . at Augsburg.' See the "Sylloge Confessionum," Oxford, 1827; in Artic. de "Potestate Ecclesiasticâ," p. 157. For the corresponding passage in the later edition of it, see ibid. p. 230.

Page 226, *line* 13. 'Chemnitz.' See Dr. Heylin, "History

of the Sabbath," ii. 6, pp. 465–468; and Mr. Baden Powell, "Christianity without Judaism," p. 236.

Page 226, *line* 21. 'Bucer.' See Dr. Heylin (ut suprà), ii. 6, p. 466; and Dean Hook's "Eccles. Biog." Art. *Bucer*.

Page 227, *line* 11. 'Peter Martyr.' See Dr. Heylin (ut suprà), ii. 6, p. 466.

Page 227, *line* 24. 'The Heidelberg Catechism.' See the "Sylloge Confess." (ut suprà). In Artic. de "Gratitudine," p. 388.

Page 228, *line* 8. 'Calvin.' "Institutes," II. c. viii. § 28–34.

Page 229, *line* 16. 'The Catechism of Geneva.' See Dr. H. A. Niemeyer's "Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis publicatarum," Art. VII. Lipsiæ, 1840.

Page 229, *line* 17. 'Beza.' Born A.D. 1519, died A.D. 1605. Dr. Heylin (ut suprà), ii. 6, p. 464, states his view thus: "Beza, Calvin's scholar and *Achates*, sings the self-same song, that, howsoever the assemblies of the Lord's Day were of Apostolical and Divine tradition, 'sic tamen ut Judaica cessatio ab omni opere non observaretur, quoniam hoc planè fuisset Judaismum non abolere, sed tantum quod ad diem attinet, immutare:' and then he adds that this cessation was first brought in by Constantine, and afterwards confirmed, with more and more restraints, by the following emperors; by means of which it came to pass that that which first was done for a good intent, viz. that men being free from their worldly businesses, might wholly give themselves to hearing the Word of God, 'in merum Judaismum degenerârit.'"

Page 229, *line* 19. 'The Helvetic Confession.' See the "Sylloge Confess." (ut suprà). In Artic. de "Feriis," &c. p. 90.

Page 231, *line* 12. 'Neither the day itself,' &c. Compare the following translation of an extract from Zuingle, the Swiss Reformer, born A.D. 1484, died A.D. 1531. It is quoted in "Christ our Rest," by a Layman, p. 182, Bath, 1856.

"Now hear, my Valentinus, how the Sabbath is rendered ceremonial. If we would have the Lord's Day so bound to time that it shall be wickedness, *in aliud tempus transferre*, to transfer it to another time, in which resting from our labours equally as in that, we may hear the Word of God, if necessity haply shall so require, this day so solicitously observed, would obtrude on us a ceremony. For we are no way bound to time, but time ought so to serve us, that it is lawful, and permitted to each Church, when necessity urges, (as is usual to be done, especially

in harvest time), to transfer the solemnity and rest of the Lord's Day or Sabbath to some other day; or on the Lord's Day itself, after finishing of the holy things, to follow their labours, though not without great necessity."—*Libel. ad Valentin. Gentil.*

Page 232, *line* 21. 'Hengstenberg.' See "The Lord's Day," pp. 69–76.

Page 232, *line* 23. 'Udemann.' Godfrey Udemann was a preacher at Zurich, and is mentioned by Brandt as having been present at the Synod of Dort.

Page 232, *line* 24. 'Teelling.' William Teelling was a Dutch theologian. He is mentioned by Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 116 (Maclaine's transl.).

Page 233, *line* 2. 'The Synod of Dort.' For a full account of this assembly, see Brandt's "History of the Reformation in and about the Low Countries," 4 vols. (English translation, London, 1722), and the "Letters from Dort," by the "ever-memorable" John Hales, in his "Golden Remains," London, 673. See also, for the proceedings after Hale's departure, Dr. Balcanqual's Letters to Sir Dudley Carlton, Hale's "Golden Remains," (ut suprà), pp. 99 seq. especially p. 162.

Page 233, *line* 7. 'Some Supplementary Sessions.' Twenty-six of these were held; of which Brandt gives the following account, B. XLII. vol. iii. p. 312:—

"A. D. 1619. After the departure of the foreigners from Dort, the Dutch divines held twenty-six Sessions more, in order to finish those matters which they had reserved to themselves or which were particularly referred to them. For which purpose we shall chiefly make use of the Synodical Writings or the *Post-Acta*, which were published in the year 1668.

"On the 16th of May, 162d Session, Afternoon,

"It was resolved that the Churches shall solemnize or keep, together with the Lord's Day, likewise Christmas Day, Easter, and Whitsunday, and the day immediately following each of the said festivals. And forasmuch as there are likewise observed in most of the towns and provinces of the Netherlands, the days of our Saviour's Circumcision and Ascension, the Ministers of all those places where the said days are not as yet observed shall use their endeavors with the civil powers to bring them all to an exact uniformity.

"And on the 7th of May, 163d Session, Morning,

"It was resolved to apply to their High Mightinesses the States General, to obviate and restrain, by new Ordinances and strict Placards, the manifold profanations of the Sabbath, which increased more and more, and spread themselves over all these Provinces.

"Upon the occasion of this resolution, there arose some debates in the Synod, about the question of the necessity of the observation of the Lord's Day. This question had already been started and canvassed in some of the Churches of Zealand. And now the Professors of Divinity, who were present at the Synod, were desired to enter into an amicable conference with the brethren of the aforesaid Province concerning that question, and at the same time to consider whether there might not be some general regulations thought of, and drawn up by common consent, within the limits of which both parties might rest contented till the new National Synod should take further cognizance of the matter."

Then follow the Six Articles which are given in the text of the Lecture.

Page 233, *lines* 15–18. 'Suggested by the English.'

"At the 148th Session they (the English Divines) likewise took notice of the great scandal which the neglect of the Lord's Day at *Dort* gave them, exhorting the Synod to interpose with the Magistrates for preventing the opening shops and the exercise of trade on *Sundays*. Upon this occasion one of the Inland Divines brought upon the stage the question about the observation of that day; but this point was reserved among the *Gravamina*, to be discussed by the *Dutch* Clergy only, after the departure of the foreigners."—*Brandt*, vol. iii. p. 290.

"Complaints were made by the English at the 14th Session, about the profanation of the Lord's Day by gaming, &c.; and they recommended an application to the Civil Magistrate to bring the people to the Afternoon Service, 'in order to have them keep the whole Sabbath as they ought.' Then 'they (the Synod) prayed the foreign Divines to acquaint them with their customs with respect to this matter; whereupon the *English* Bishop told them first, that in his country the Civil Magistrate set a fine or pecuniary penalty upon those who forebore coming to Divine Service, according to their duty; and such a fine wrought much more on the people than any the most pious exhortations.'"—*Brandt*, vol. iii. pp. 28, 29.

John Hales, "Letters" (ut suprà), p. 5, reports to Sir Dudley Carlton the Bishop's reply, much in the same language, and he goes on to state what others said. "Those of the *Palsgrave's Country* showed that each Sunday they had two Sermons, and such as were absent were first admonished by the Clergy; and if this sufficed not, they required the help of the Civil Magistrate. Those of *Geneva* told us that in the churches in their cities they had every Sunday four Sermons, &c. Those of *Breme*, that they had three Sermons, of which one was catechetical; and to avoid profanation of the Sabbath, it was not lawful to celebrate any Marriage Feast or such like upon the Sunday, till six o'clock in the evening."

Gerard Brandt, born A.D. 1626, died A.D. 1685. He was for a large part of his life the minister of a congregation of Remonstrants or Arminians, at Nieuwkoop.

John Hales, born A.D. 1584, died A.D. 1656. As chaplain to the English Ambassador to the Hague, Sir Dudley Carlton, he was able to procure admission to the open Sessions at Dort. The effect upon his own mind was a desertion of Calvinism for Arminianism.

Page 235, *line* 11. 'Gomarus.' Francis Gomar, or Gomarus, born A.D. 1563, died A.D. 1641. From him the Calvinists, or a section of them, were sometimes called Gomarists. His chief works on the subject were, "Examen Sabbati;" "Investigatio Sentent. de Orig. Sabb.;" "Defensio investig. de Orig. Sabbati."

Page 235, *line* 20. 'Rivetus.' Andrew Ryvet, or Rivetus, born A.D. 1572, died A.D. 1647. He was originally a French Protestant. See his "Commentar. in *Exod.*;" especially his "Explic. Decalogi, Exod. xx."

Page 235, *line* 20. 'Walæus.' Anthony Walæus, born A.D. 1573, died A.D. 1639. See his "Dissertatio de Quarto Precepto."

Page 235, *line* 22. 'Ames.' William Ames, or Amesius, an Englishman, born A.D. 1576, died A.D. 1633, wrote "De Origine Sabbati et Diei Dominicæ." The Biographie Universelle says of him, that in his "Puritanismus Anglicanus," "il semble regarder les Puritains comme les seuls honnêtes gens de l'Angleterre."

Page 235, *line* 24. 'Voëtius.' Gisbert Voët, or Voëtius, born A.D. 1589, died A.D. 1676. Some of the adherents of Calvinism, says Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 240, were called after his name.

Page 236, *line* 5. 'Heidanus.' Abraham Heidan, or Hei-

danus, born A.D. 1597, died A.D. 1678. Cocceius speaks of him as his colleague, and as having held a "Disputatio de Sabbato et die Dominicâ," and also a second in defence of the former.

Page 236, *line* 5. 'Cocceius.' John Cock, or Cocceius, born A.D. 1603, died A.D. 1669. Mosheim gives an account of him, vol. ii. p. 258. He wrote a great deal on the subject of the Lord's Day. See especially his "Indagatio Naturæ Sabbati et Quæstio Novi Testamenti;" his "Testimonia Veterum et Recentiorum Ecclesiæ Doctorum", (a valuable document, but drawn up with too much partisanship); and his "Typus Concordiæ Amicorum circa Honorem Dominicæ."

Page 236, *line* 14. 'Hoornbeeck.' John Hoornbeeck, born A.D. 1617, died A.D. 1666. He is mentioned by Hengstenberg, "The Lord's Day," p. 70; but I have not seen any of his works.

Page 236, *line* 23. 'Essen.' Andrew Essen, born A.D. 1618, died A.D. 1672. See his "Disquisitio de Moralitate Sabbati Hebdomadalis;" his "Dissertationes de Decalogo, &c. adversus Abrah. Heidanum;" and his "Vindiciæ Quarti Præcepti in Decalogo." This last was written in answer to Francis Burmann, who defended the view of Cocceius.

Page 236, *line* 24. 'Burmann.' Francis Burmann, born A.D. 1632, died A.D. 1679. A treatise of his, "De Moralitate Sabbati," brought him into conflict with Essen. See August. Ep. lxxxii. tom. ii. col. 257, for the quotation in the text.

Page 237, *line* 2. 'Maresius.' Samuel des Marêts, or Maresius, born A.D. 1599, died A.D. 1663. He is mentioned by Hengstenberg (ut suprà), p. 70; but I am not acquainted with his works.

Page 237, *line* 4. 'Alting.' James Alting, born A.D. 1618, died A.D. 1679. See his "Hebræorum Respublica."

Page 237, *line* 29. 'Fecht.' John Fecht, or Fechtius, born A.D. 1636, died A.D. 1716. Hengstenberg, (ut suprà), p. 70, speaks highly of his research and learning.

Page 238, *line* 7. 'Schwartz.' Hengstenberg (ut suprà), p. 71, has described his work thus: "A true Account of the Sabbath, in reply to Burmann's false doctrine, which a minister in Holstein, (Lünekogel), has sanctioned, and introduced into Germany, with evil consequences to the Land."

Page 238, *line* 11. 'Mayer.' John Frederic Mayer, born A.D. 1650, died A.D. 1712.

Page 238, *line* 15. 'Stryk.' John Samuel Stryk, or Strykius, born A.D. 1640, died A.D. 1710. See his "Commentatio de Jure Sabbati."

Page 239, *line* 4. 'Buddæus.' John Francis Budd, or Buddæus, born A.D. 1667, died A.D. 1729. See his "Institut. Theol. Moralis."

Page 239, *line* 6. 'Spener.' Philip James Spener, born A.D. 1635, died A.D. 1705. His view is set forth very graphically by Hengstenberg, (ut suprà), pp. 73, 74.

Page 239, *line* 18. 'Dr. Chalmers.' The passage quoted in the text of the Lecture will be found in his Sermon on "The Christianity of the Sabbath," Congreg. Serm. vol. ii. Serm. XIII.

Page 241, *line* 8. 'Mosheim.' John Lawrence Mosheim. See his "Eccl. Hist." passim, and also the two passages following from his "De Rebus Christianorum ante Constant. Magn. Comm." pp. 112–116.

"Populus Christi Hierosolymitanus, tametsi publica Judæorum sacra haud deserebat, suos tamen etiam conventus rei Divinæ faciendæ causâ celebrabat, in quibus ab Apostolis instituebatur, communes preces fundebat, et memoriam Jesu Christi per sacram cœnam repetebat. Diem his conventibus dicatum illum fuisse, quo Jesus Christus in vitam rediit, certum magis est, quam verisimile."

"Pro certo sumi potest, diem hebdomadis primum, quo de morte triumphum egit sanctissimus Servator, ab ipsis Apostolis Hierosolymis commorantibus, conventibus Christianorum sacris dicatum fuisse. Videmus Troadenses Christianos primo post Sabbatum Judæorum die ad sacram cœnam et simul convivium amoris celebrandum convenire, et S. Paulum in illo cœtu longum sermonem recitare: Actor. xx. 7, *μίαν* enim *τῶν σαββάτων*, quâ conventus hic agebatur, diem indicare, quæ Sabbatum Judæorum excipiebat, argumentis omni exceptione superioribus viri docti demonstratum viderunt. Ecquis neget, Troadenses auctoritate Apostolorum et exemplo cœtus Hierosolymitani, quem omnes imitabantur familiæ Christianæ, hunc diem divino cultui dedicâsse? Ecquis S. Paulum, Apostolum, gnarum disciplinæ Hierosolymitanæ, alium sibi persuadeat diem sacris publicis destinare voluisse, quam illum, quo reliquos Apostolos Hierosolymis degentes conventus agere solere noverat?"

Page 242, *line* 2. 'C. C. L. Franke.' "De Diei Dominici apud Veteres Christianos celebratione."

Page 242, *line* 25. 'E. W. Hengstenberg.' The whole of the earlier portion of his work, "The Lord's Day," to p. 88, must be considered as negative or destructive. He begins "to build" at that point. I have stated his argument as concisely, but as fairly as I can.

Page 246, *lines* 9 and 10. 'Oschwald and Liebetrut,' mentioned by Hengstenberg, (ut suprà, p. 106). With Oschwald's work, which appears to have been a prize essay, I am not acquainted. That of Liebetrut is "Die Sonntagsfeier," Hamburgh, 1851.

Page 246, *line* 12. 'Certain Sabbatarian efforts,' &c.

Hengstenberg, (ut suprà), p. 55, speaks of "attempts originating in England, but principally made through the medium of the Tract Society in Lower Saxony, to introduce Sabbatarian doctrines into Germany." In page 53, he gives an extract from Gemberg's "Scotch Church," which he says "contains an outline of the opinions generally held in Great Britain and America." And in page 77, he says, "We shall confine ourselves chiefly to the arguments brought together by Dwight in his 'Theology,' from the conviction that this theologian, who is highly esteemed in England and America, has collected all the arguments, including those which are only apparent ones, which have ever been used in support of his views." He is of course referring to Dr. Dwight's five Sermons on the subject of the Sabbath, Serm. CV.–CIX. They are referable to what I have called in Lecture I. pp. 8, 9, the view of Bishops Horsley and Jebb. Hengstenberg's idea of the *status* given to the Decalogue by English Theologians has been noticed already. See note to Lecture V. p. 203, l. 28.

Page 246, *line* 26. 'Hengstenberg somewhat admires our English Sunday.' This is evident from the concluding words of his treatise on "the Lord's Day," but he takes care to declare his conviction that what is good in it is "not the product of the theory itself," (Sabbatarianism), but is attributable to other causes which he enumerates. These are, "the Christian fear of God, so deeply rooted in the hearts of the people"—"the ceaseless bustle and restlessness which characterise so large a part of the population both of England and of America," and which, he says elsewhere, "makes them observe it strictly by an impulse

to spiritual self-preservation," and lastly, "the love of law which is so prevalent there."

Page 247, *line* 6. 'He is not singular . . . in attributing these views to the English Church.' In addition to the passages from Olshausen and Chevalier Bunsen, (Hippolytus, &c. vol. ii. 218), mentioned in the text of the Lecture, the following may be brought from Kurtz, "History of the Old Covenant," vol. iii. p. 42 (Martin's transl.). After stating that he "regards the Sabbatic festival as ante-legal—in other words, as an institution of Paradise"—he goes on, "but we are very far from intending thereby to support that unspiritual, unevangelical bondage, which prevails both in exegesis and in practice on the other side the Channel." Some of our own writers have contributed to this impression. The author of "Companions of my Solitude," for instance, in speaking of Sunday in a German town, says, "In those unfortunate regions they have not made a ghastly idol of Sunday."—P. 122.

Page 247, *line* 25. 'His own view, *i.e.* Chevalier Bunsen's, is in accordance with that of Hengstenberg.' See the continuation of the passage quoted in the text. An American periodical, "Bibl. Repertory," for October, 1859, p. 753, refers to Hübner, Professor in Wittenberg, as a representative of the Lutheran element of the United Church of Prussia." "In his edition of Büchner's Exegetisch-homiletisches Lexicon, (says the reviewer), he maintains that the Sabbath was instituted in Paradise, and that the observance of such a day 'is plainly no local or temporary command, but an original necessity of the spiritual nature of man: he must suppress all aspiration after the heavenly and invisible, and sink into the earthly and even the brutal, without the Sabbath.'"

Page 248, *line* 2. 'The testimony which nearly every language of the Continent affords to the difference between the Sabbath and the Sunday.'

Saturday, in Italian, still retains the Hebrew name of "Sabato;" so it does, with the slight literal variations which distinguish the several languages, in Spanish and Portuguese. The French "Samedi" is properly explained by Ménagè as merely an abridgment of "Sabbati-di;" just as "Mardi" is of "Marti-di," and "Vendredi" of "Veneri-di." The journals of the English House of Parliament still designate Saturday by the name of "Dies Sabbati."

Sunday holds its Christian title even more tenaciously than Saturday holds its Jewish title. "The Lord's Day" of our own language appears, through the Latin "Dies Dominica," in France as "Dimanche," in Portuguese as "Domingo," &c. In Russian the designation of it is "The Day of Resurrection," or, more simply, "Resurrection."

The Germans call *Sunday* "Sonntag," and the old name of *Saturday* was "Sætres dæg" (Anglo-Saxon). These, and the designations of the other days of the week, which we share with them, may be accounted for by the fact that the Teutonic nations received the hebdomadal division, and its nomenclature, from the Romans before their conversion to Christianity. They afterwards adopted for *Saturday*, partially at least, "Samstag," viz. "Sabbats-tag," and "Sonn-abend," or "eve of Sunday," Sæter being considered as the name of an evil being. The Romance nations were earlier under the influence of the Church, so far as these two days were concerned. See Grimm's "German Mythology," p. 111, and Ideler's "Handbuch der Chronologie," p. 177.

Page 248, *line* 7. 'Notre Dame de la Salette.' This somewhat reminds one of Eustace, Abbot of Flay. See note to Lecture III. p. 120, l. 9.

Page 248, *line* 12. 'Le Dimanche tu sanctifieras.' The French metrical version of the Decalogue, alluded to in the text of the Lecture, is found in the "Catéchisme du Diocèse de Paris," 1857. The first four commandments, which are by suppression of the second made into three, are expressed thus:—

1. "Un seul Dieu tu adoreras,
   Et aimeras parfaitement.
2. "Dieu en vain tu ne jureras,
   Ni autre chose pareillement.
3. "Les Dimanches tu garderas,
   En servant Dieu dévotement."

The same misrepresentation of the Fourth Commandment occurs in the comment upon it.

"Q. Quel est le jour du Seigneur?

"R. Avant la venue de Jésus-Christ, le jour du Seigneur était le Samedi, en mémoire du repos de Dieu, après qu'il eut créé le monde; maintenant, c'est le Dimanche, en l'honneur de la résurrection de notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ."—P. 87.

And so inveterate has it become, that one of the directions to the members of the French Association for the observance of the

Lord's Day, which will be mentioned in the next note, is to this effect:—

"Réciter une fois par jour un *Ave* et le troisième (quatrième) commandement de Dieu: *Le Dimanche tu garderas, en servant Dieu dévotement.*"

It will be observed that the French version of the Fourth Commandment differs from that in the authorized Italian Catechism quoted in page 253 of this Lecture, "Ricordati di sanctificare le Feste." This variation has caused an alteration in the "Commandments of the Church." Of the six given in the Italian document, the fifth and sixth, relating to the payment of tithes and forbearing to marry during the prohibited seasons, are omitted entirely; the second, which relates to fasting, is divided into two, and takes their place; while the first, "Udir la Messa tutti le Domeniche, ed altre Feste comandate," is thus divided for first and second.

1. "Les Fêtes tu sanctifieras
   Qui te sont de commandement.
2. Les Dimanches, la Messe ouïras,
   Et les Fêtes pareillement."

Page 248, *line* 13. 'A tract by the Abbé Mullois.'

Le Dimanche au Peuple, par M. L'Abbé Mullois. He writes as follows, in page 10: "Eh bien, mes amis, il y a une loi de Dieu qui ordonne la sanctification du Dimanche, c'est un article du code divin, article tombé sur le monde au milieu des éclairs et de la foudre du Sinaï. Et voici ce que Dieu a dit: '*Je suis le Maître, souviens-toi de sanctifier le jour du Dimanche.*'" He speaks of Germany in page 30, and of the suspension of the works at the Tuileries in page 31. (Probably his influence caused the regulation which one has heard of recently, that the theatre at the camp of Chalons should not be open on Sunday.) The passages condemning the French Sunday, and praising that which he supposes to exist in England, occur in pages 7 and 30 respectively. The Abbé Mullois has written another tract, *Le Dimanche aux Classes élevées de la Société*, from page 13 of which it is evident that I have not misrepresented his transformation of the Fourth Commandment. "Dieu a parlé; du haut de sa formidable puissance, il a laissé tomber sur le monde ces paroles: 'Je suis votre maître, et vous n'en avez pas d'autre. . . . . *Souvenez-vous de sanctifier le jour du*

Dimanche.' . . . Voici un ordre clair et formel . . et il ne sera pas écouté et il ne sera pas obéi."

Page 249, *line* 25. 'An association exists in Paris.' This association has its head-quarters at 33, *Rue de Verneuil*, at Paris, from whence tracts are issued, and where a periodical called "L'Observateur *du Dimanche*" is published. This has now reached its seventh volume. It contains intelligence as to the working of district associations throughout the country, reviews of books on the subject, instructions for operations, practical hints, and various religious papers bearing more or less upon it. In the number for July, 1860, it has a translation of Queen Victoria's revised proclamation against vice and immorality, and remarks with satisfaction the regard paid in it to "Le Jour du Seigneur :"—

"Nous ne nous permettrons qu'une seule réflexion sur ce document si remarquable. Si un prince catholique avait publié un édit pareil, la presse anti-religieuse n'aurait pas manqué de crier à l'esprit rétrograde, au retour au moyen âge, à l'inquisition ! à toutes les absurdités enfin dont ils repaissent quotidiennement leurs lecteurs. Qu'oseront-ils dire sur l'Angleterre protestante ?"

The tracts, though chargeable with the objections which I mention in the text of this Lecture, are of a practical tendency, as their titles indicate. *Repos du Dimanche, aux Ouvriers. Guide Pratique du Chrétien, fidèle Observateur du Repos du Dimanche. Réflexions sur les Travaux du Dimanche. Réflexions adressées aux Dames sur le Repos du Dimanche. De la Vente dans les Campagnes le Dimanche*, &c. They are accompanied by the Pope's *Bref en faveur de l'Association de Paris*, &c. which includes promises of Indulgences of various degrees—and by *Instruction pour établir des Associations*, emanating from the Central Committee. The Abbé Mullois, in the second of his publications mentioned in the preceding note, is very earnestly in favour of the General Association, and mentions that by 1858 it had already branches in various important towns. And the Abbé Gaume, (better known to the world as the author of *Ver Rongeur*), is equally zealous in the same cause. His work is entitled, *La Profanation du Dimanche, considérée au point de vue de la Religion, de la Société, de la Famille, de la Liberté, du Bien-être, de la Dignité Humaine, et de la Santé.*

It will appear from the extracts made in the text of the Lecture,

that the Abbé Gaume thinks favourably of the observance of the Lord's Day, both in England and in America. He does not, of course, know how much room for improvement exists in both countries, especially in their capitals. But London must not be judged of from its worst specimens. As for New York, the Bishop of that See, who was recently in England, tells me that the Lord's Day is better observed there than it used to be—in fact, that much reverence is paid to it. He added, however, that in the German quarter it is sadly profaned, all sorts of excesses being practised in the most undisguised manner.

Page 251, *line* 27. 'Louis Victor Mellet.' His work is translated under the title of "Sunday and the Sabbath."

Page 252, *line* 9. 'In Spain and Portugal.' "At Madrid there is an improvement, if such a word is applicable to so barbarous a practice, in respect to bull-fights. The day appointed for them used to be Sunday, but now Monday is the chief day, because people were prevented going to church. In the provinces, Sunday or a week-day is used indifferently, as the professional *toreros* can be procured. This applies to the exhibitions of *toros de muerte*, bulls who are to be killed. There are minor sports with what are called *novillos*, or young bulls, which are teased and played tricks with, but not killed; these smaller diversions generally take place on Sunday, and are a favorite rustic amusement." Mr. J. L. Adolphus has kindly given me this statement.

Page 252, *line* 11. 'In Reformed Geneva.' For a description of a Genevese Sunday, see Laing's "Notes of a Traveller," pp. 324—326, London, 1842. "I happened to be at Geneva on Sunday morning as the bells were tolling to church. . . . I hastened to the ancient cathedral, the church of St. Peter, to see the pulpit from which Calvin had preached, to sit, probably, in the very seat from which John Knox had listened, to hear the pure doctrines of Christianity from the preachers who now stand where once the great champions of the Reformation stood; to mark, too, the order and observances of the Calvinistic service here in its native Church; to revive, too, in my mind, Scotland and the picturesque Sabbath Days of Scotland in a foreign land. But where is the stream of citizens' families in the streets, so remarkable a feature in every Scotch town when the bells are tolling to church, family after family, all so decent and respectable in their Sunday clothes, the fathers and mothers leading

the younger children, and all walking silently churchwards? And where the quiet, the repose, the stillness of the Sabbath morning, so remarkable in every Scotch town and house? . . . Rome has still superstition; Geneva has not even that semblance of religion. In the head church of the original seat of Calvinism, in a city of five and twenty thousand souls, at the only service on the Sabbath Day—there being no evening service—I sat down in a congregation of about two hundred females, and three and twenty males, mostly elderly men of a former generation, with scarcely a youth, or boy, or working-man, among them. A meagre liturgy, or printed form of prayer, a sermon, which, so far as religion was concerned, might have figured the evening at some geological society as an 'ingenious essay' on the Mosaic Chronology; a couple of psalm tunes on the organ, and a waltz to go out with, were the Church service. In the afternoon the only service in towns or in the country is reading a chapter of the Bible to the children, and hearing them gabble over the Catechism in a way which shows they have not a glimpse of its meaning. A pleasure-tour in the steam-boats—which are regularly advertised for a Sunday promenade round the lake—a pic-nic dinner in the country, and overflowing congregations in the evening at the theatre, the equestrian circus, the concert-saloons, ball-rooms, and coffee-houses, are all that distinguish Sunday from Monday. . . . In the village churches along the Protestant side of the Lake of Geneva . . . the rattling of the billiard-balls, the rumbling of the skittle-trough, the shout, the laugh, the distant shots of the rifle-gun clubs, are heard above the psalm, the sermon, and the barren forms of State-prescribed prayer, during the one brief service on Sundays, delivered to very scanty congregations—in fact, to a few females and a dozen or two old men—in very populous parishes, supplied with able and zealous ministers."

Page 252, *line* 16. 'Protestant Sweden.' For the case before Lord Campbell, see "Dublin Review" for Sept. 1858, p. 29; and for the statement respecting the Diet, see "The People's Day," by William Arthur, A.M., which is quoted in Lecture VIII. pp. 324, 325.

Page 253, *line* 2. 'The Catechism drawn up by Bellarmine.' See notes to Lecture II. p. 42, l. 18; and to Lecture VI. p. 248, l. 26.

LECTURE VII.

Page 256, *line* 24. 'The Westminster Confession.' See Article xxi. of that document, §§ 7, 8.

Page 258, *line* 8. 'The Larger and Shorter Catechisms.' See the Larger Catechism, Questions 116–121, and the Shorter Catechism, Questions 58–62.

Page 260, *line* 16. 'All were agreed as to the fact of the inspiration of Holy Scripture.'

Some valuable remarks on the subject of the inspiration of Holy Scripture will be found in Bishop Thirlwall's "Letter to Dr. Rowland Williams," pp. 38, &c.

Page 260, *line* 30. 'Table of Proper Lessons for Sundays and Holydays.' I am aware that this Table did not exist at first; but I am speaking of the Prayer-Book as it exists *now*, after all the changes that it has undergone.

Page 261, *line* penult. 'The Savoy Conference.' See "An Accompt of all the Proceedings of the Commissioners of both Perswasions appointed by his Sacred Majesty," &c. London, 1661. Also, Collier's "Eccl. Hist." Part II. Book IX. p. 881, fol. Lond. 1714.

Page 263, *line* 24. 'The Institution of a Christian Man;' and in *line* 25, 'A necessary Doctrine,' &c. See "Formularies of Faith," pp. 21 and 213 seq. respectively, Oxford, 1825.

Page 265, *line* 10. 'Tyndale.' The passage in the text of the Lecture is from Tyndale's "Answer to Sir Thomas More," p. 287.

Page 265, *line* penult. 'Fryth.' See Fryth's Works, p. 69.

Page 266, *line* 17. 'Cranmer's Catechism of A.D. 1548,' p. 40, Oxf. Edit. 1829.

Page 266, *line* 18. 'Confutation of Unwritten Verities.' Printed among the Works of Abp. Cranmer, Jenkyn's Edit. vol. iv. p. 234.

Page 266, *line* 26. 'The Book of Prayer set forth in the last year of Henry VIII.' See Cox's "Sabbath Laws," &c. p. 289.

Page 267, *line* 15. 'The Homilies.' In B. I. x. 1, the Book of Wisdom is called "the infallible and undeceivable Word of God:" in B. II. ii. 3, occurs the phrase, "As the Word

of God doth testify, Wisd. xiii. xiv. :" and in B. II. xi. 2, "The same lesson doth the Holy Ghost teach in sundry places of Scripture, saying, 'Mercifulness and almsgiving,' &c. Tobit iv. The wise preacher, the son of Sirach, confirmeth the same when he says, that 'as water quencheth burning fire,'" &c. Again, in B. I. vii. 1, "By holy promises we be made lively members of Christ, receiving the sacrament of Baptism. By like holy promises the sacrament of Matrimony knitteth man and wife in perpetual love:" and in B. II. ix. "It (Ordination) lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other sacraments besides the two above named do. Therefore neither it nor any other sacrament else, be such sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are." See Lecture V. p. 212.

Page 267, *line* 25. 'The injunctions of Edward the 6th.' In his first year. See "Wilkins' Conc." iv. 6. For 'Abp. Cranmer's Visitation Articles,' see "Wilkins' Conc." iv. 24, Art. 25.

Page 268, *line* 2. 'As Heylin does.' "History of the Sabbath," Part II. c. viii. §§ 2, 3.

Page 268, *line* 23. '*The Confession* drawn up by John Knox.' See Laing's edit. of his "Works," vol. ii. pp. 107–109. It is also found in the folio Acts of Parliament for Scotland, vol. ii. p. 256, 1814; and in Dunlop's "Collection of Scottish Confessions," vol. ii. p. 526.

Page 269, *line* 17. In the "Book of Discipline" all Saints' Days indeed are disallowed, but the Lord's Day is retained, and called *Sunday*, not *the Sabbath*. Its origin is not discussed, but its obligation is assumed. Some of the features of the Book are as follows: In great towns it is thought expedient that every day there should be either Sermon or else Common Prayer, with some exercise of reading the Scriptures. In every notable town it is required that one day besides the Sunday be appointed to the Sermon and Prayers, "which, during the time of Sermon, must be kept free from all exercise of labour, as well of the master as of the servants." . . . "But the Sunday must straitly be kept, both before and after noon, in all towns." . . . "How much is appointed for Sunday is already 'distinctit' in our Book of Common Order." It is also to be observed that prayers be used at afternoon upon the Sunday, where there is neither preaching nor Catechism." The Lord's Supper seems no longer

considered a necessary element in the Lord's Day Service, for a celebration of it four times in the year is thought sufficient. See Knox's "Works," (ut suprà), vol. ii. p. 238.

Page 269, *line* 20. 'Pocklington.' See his "Sunday no Sabbath," a Visitation Sermon, by John Pocklington, D.D. The passage to which Dr. Pocklington alludes, p. 6 of his Sermon, occurs in a criticism upon the English Service Book drawn up by Knox, Whittingham, Dean of Durham, and others, and addressed to Calvin. "Besides, vppon every Sabothe daie, Wensdaie, and Fridaie, there is yet in vse certeine suffrages deuised off Pope Gregory, whiche beginnethe after this manner: 'O God the father off heaven,' &c. p. xxx. And in p. lxx. are the words, 'beinge the sabath daie.'" But these are exceptions to the general terminology of the document. *Sunday* is the word used in pp. vi. xxxviii. cxii. and cxvii.; Wednesdays, Thursdays, and *Sundays* are mentioned for Sermons, and the youth are to resort to Church on Saturdays and *Sundays* in the afternoon for catechizing. (See Petheram's reprint of "A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort in the year A.D. 1554," London, 1847.) I think, therefore, that the author of "Sunday no Sabbath" makes the most of the careless employment of the word *Sabbath*, for such I am convinced it was. His excuse is, that he preached his Sermon in A.D. 1635, when the use of the word had become obtrusively systematic. "What shall we think then of Knox, Whittingham, and their fellows, that in their letter to Calvin depart from the constitution, ordinance, and practice of the Apostles and Apostolic men, and call not this day the Lord's Day, or Sunday, but, with the piety of Jeroboam, make such a day of it as they have devised in their own hearts, to serve their own turn, and anabaptizing of it after the mind of some Jew hired to be the godfather thereof, call it the Sabbath, and so disguised with that name, become both the first that so called it, and the Testators that have so bequeathed it to their Disciples and Proselytes to be observed accordingly." He goes on to say that "it was full thirty years before their children could turn their tongues from *Sunday* to hit on *Sabbath;*" and in p. 7 speaks of the year A.D. 1584 as about the thirty-first year of the Sabbath's nativity." In the Edinburgh edition of the "Form of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, &c. used in the English Church at Geneva," the word

Sunday not *Sabbath* is employed. The work was originally put out in A.D. 1556; this edition is dated A.D. 1562. Another title of it is, "The Book of our Common Order, commonly called the Order of Geneva." See Knox's "Works," (ut suprà), vol. ii. 210, and vol. iv. 155.

Page 270, *line* 1. 'Randolph, writing to Cecil.' See Wright's "Queen Elizabeth and her Times," vol. ii. p. 114.

Page 270, *line* 8. 'It is said on one occasion.' "At Geneva a tradition exists, that when John Knox visited Calvin on a Sunday, he found his austere coadjutor bowling on a green. At this day, and in that place, a Calvinist preacher, after his Sunday sermon, will take his seat at the card-table."—Disraeli, "Charles the First," vol. ii. p. 16. (See also Strype's Life of Bp. Aylmer, c. xi.) On the same page Disraeli quotes, as an instance of the common mistake of attributing over-strictness of Sunday observance to Calvin, a note of Thomas Warton on the Lady's speech in *Comus*, verse 177. "It is owing to the Puritans, ever since Cromwell's time, that *Sunday* has been made in England a day of gravity and severity; and many a staunch observer of the rites of the Church of England little suspects that he is conforming to the *Calvinism of an English Sunday*." This note, Disraeli observes, was afterwards suppressed. The reason probably was that the author had discovered his mistake. But, if Warton made a mistake in this respect, Disraeli has made one also in attributing, as he does, the Scotch Sunday to Knox. It really travelled northward from the English Puritans.

Page 270, *line* 24. 'Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions.' See "Wilkins' Conc." iv. 184; Inj. 20 and 33, and iv. 190.

Page 270, *line* ult. 'A license to one John Seconton.' See T. Hearne's "Preface to Camden's Elizabeth," quoted by Disraeli, "Charles I." vol. ii. p. 15. See also E. V. Neale's "Feasts and Fasts," p. 225.

Page 271, *line* 3. 'The London magistracy.' See Dr. Heylin, "Hist. of the Sabb." Part II. c. viii. § 7.

Page 271, *line* 19, 'Puritans.' See Dr. Arnold's "Lectures on Modern History," Lecture V. pp. 206 seq.

Page 273, *line* 24. 'And a phrase,' &c. Gen. iv. 3. So Job i. 6, "There was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord," was presumed to imply the Sabbath Day.

Page 274, *line* 21. 'Shakspere.' *Merchant of Venice*, IV. 1, and *Hamlet*, I. 1. He speaks of "sighing away Sundays," in *Much Ado About Nothing*, I. 1; and of "velvet guards and Sunday citizens," in 1 *Henry IV.* III. 1.

Page 274, *line* 29. 'The name Lord's Day.' In the "Accompt, &c." of the Savoy Conference, already mentioned, we find, though so long afterwards, a remnant of the dislike to the word *Sunday*. In the general objections, number Eleven, (p. 6), the Presbyterians desired "that instead of the word *Sunday*, the word *Lord's Day* may be everywhere used." The reply of the Episcopalians was, (p. 58), "The word *Sunday* is ancient, as may be seen from Justin Martyr, Apol. Prim. pp. 97, 98, and therefore not to be left off."

Page 274, *line* penult. 'The form of discipline,' &c. See Fuller's "Church Hist." vol. v. pp. 1, 2 (Brewer's edit.).

Page 275, *line* 1. 'Grindal.' See his "Injunctions," whilst yet Archbishop of York, in "Wilkins' Conc." iv. 266; but I am speaking rather of the general tone, both of Grindal and of Sandys, than of any specific acts.

Page 275, *line* 25. 'Judgments were said to follow,' &c.

As long back as A.D. 1582, Strype has this minute, "Annals of the Church under Eliz." (vol. iii. p. 201, Oxford Edit. 1824). "In the diary of the said Recorder, of transactions in the City, customarily sent to the Lord Treasurer, he mentioned 'the punishment of the violators of the Sabbath by God's Providence at Paris Garden in Southwark: where were sports on that day for entertainment of great confluences of people to see them, mounted upon scaffolds, that fell down.' The day after . . . Sir Thomas Blank, mayor, sent notice . . . to Lord Burghley the Treasurer . . . of the great mishap yesterday, being the Lord's Day. He addeth piously, 'It gives great occasion to acknowledge the hand of God for such abuse of His Sabbath Day; and moveth me in conscience to beseech your Lordship to give order for redress of such contempt of God's service.'" Daniel Neale, "History of the Puritans" (vol. i. p. 343, London, 1793), notices the occurrence, and adds, "But the court paid no regard to such remonstrances, and the Queen had her ends, in encouraging the sports, pastimes, and revellings of the people on Sundays and holidays."

Page 275, *line* penult. 'Dr. Bownd's main propositions as

given by Fuller.' See Fuller's "Church History," vol. v. pp. 212—214.

Page 277, *line* 25. 'The desecration of Sunday.' "Practical religion, (says Daniel Neale, writing of A.D. 1582), was at a very low ebb; the fashionable vices of the times were, profane swearing, drunkenness, revelling, gaming, and profanation of the Lord's Day; yet there was no discipline for offenders," &c.—Vol. i. (ut suprà), p. 342.

Page 278, *line* 4. 'It is almost incredible, says Fuller.' See vol. v. (ut suprà), p. 214.

The passage quoted in the text goes on thus :—

"On this day the stoutest fencer laid down the buckler, the most skilful archer unbent his bow, counting all shooting beside the mark; May-games and Morris-dances grew out of request; and good reason that bells should be silenced from jingling on men's legs, if very ringing in steeples were adjudged unlawful. Some of them were ashamed of their former pleasures, like children, which, grown bigger, blushing themselves out of their rattles and whistles; others forbear them for fear of their superiors; and many left them off out of a politic compliance, lest otherwise they should be accounted licentious."

Page 278, *line* 13. 'Abp. Whitgift,' and line 17, 'Lord Chief Justice Popham.' See Fuller, vol. v. (ut suprà) p. 217.

Page 278, *line* 24. 'Mentioned by Strype.' In his "Life of Whitgift," p. 415.

Page 279, *line* 18. 'Which an able opponent of it called "more than either kingly or popely."' This opponent was Thomas Rogers, of Horninger, in Suffolk, chaplain to Abp. Bancroft, in his preface to a work upon "The Thirty-nine Articles," London, 1633. Fuller describes him as "the first that gave a check to the full speed of this doctrine." Vol. v. (ut suprà) pp. 216, 217.

Page 279, *line* 20. '"Learned men," says Fuller.' Vol. v. (ut suprà) p. 215. These men may have been *learned* in their way, but those of the first class were obviously not men of historical research, or they would not have supposed Sabbatarianism to have the slightest foundation in antiquity. Those of the second class must have been ignorant of one of the first principles in morals, if they thought it justifiable "to deceive persons

to their good;" this would nullify St. Paul's condemnation of "doing evil that good may come," and excuse every "pious fraud" that has ever been imagined: and those of the third class exhibited great confusion of thought in imagining that our Lord's treatment of the Sabbath had anything to do *directly* with the Lord's Day. If they disliked the Sabbatarian doctrines, their method should have been to show, from the writings of the Apostles that the Sabbath was now abrogated, and from the practice of the Apostles that Christianity possessed a more free and unfettered institution, the Lord's Day. Our Lord's treatment of the Sabbath might then have been introduced *indirectly*, somewhat in the following manner: If under the Jewish dispensation He did not wish *it* to be a burden, *à fortiori*, under the Christian, the somewhat analogous Christian institution cannot have been intended to be so burdensome as the Puritan view would make it.

Page 280, *line* 11. 'Hooker.' See Lecture IV. p. 144, l. 2.

Page 281, *line* 27. 'Whitgift was scarcely dead.' The succession of Archbishops of Canterbury was as follows: Parker, A.D. 1559; Grindal, 1575; Whitgift, 1583; Bancroft, 1604; Abbot, 1611; Laud, 1633—1645. And of Bishops of London: Grindal, A.D. 1559; Sandys, 1570; Aylmer, 1577; Fletcher, 1594; Bancroft, 1597; Vaughan, 1604; Ravis, 1607; Abbot, 1610; King, 1611; Monteigne, 1621; Laud, 1628; Juxon, 1633—1660.

Page 281, *line* 28. 'As Fuller,' &c. Vol. v. (ut suprà), p. 215.

Page 281, *line* penult. 'And Heylin says.' "History of the Sabbath," Part II. c. viii. p. 489.

Page 282, *line* 17. 'They found time hang heavily on their hands.'

Sir Walter Scott, in his "Rob Roy," c. xi. gives a sketch of a not very well educated country family, which might almost have been written in the reign of James I. "The next morning happened to be Sunday, a day peculiarly hard to be got rid of at Osbaldistone Hall; for, after the formal religious service of the morning had been performed, at which all the family regularly attended, it was hard to say upon which individual, Rashleigh and Miss Vernon excepted, the fiend of *ennui* descended with the most abundant outpouring of his spirit." Sir Hildebrand is amused for a few minutes with talking of his nephew's embarrassment

of the day before, but at length says, "'Talking of heraldry, I'll go and read Gwillym.' This resolution he intimated with a yawn, resistless as that of the goddess in the Dunciad, which was responsively echoed by his giant sons, as they dispersed in quest of the pastimes to which their minds severally inclined them—Percie to discuss a pot of March beer with the steward in the buttery; Thorncliff to cut a pair of cudgels, and to fix them in their wicker hilts; John to dress May-flies; Dickon to play at pitch and toss by himself, his right hand against his left; and Wilfred to bite his thumbs, and hum himself into a slumber which should last till dinner-time, if possible."

Page 282, *line* 19. '"The Book of Sports."' A complete account of this document, and of the ferment that it produced, and of the expedients adopted to evade reading it, or to neutralize its effects, may be found in Fuller, "Church History," vol. v. pp. 452, seq.; and in Neale, "History of the Puritans," vol. ii. pp. 235, seq. It is said to have been drawn up by Moreton, at that time Bishop of Chester, afterwards of Coventry and Lichfield, and finally of Durham. See Daniel Neale, "History of the Puritans," vol. ii. p. 114, who adds, on the authority of Wilson, that Archbishop Abbot would not allow it to be read at Croydon.

Page 283, *line* 11. '"The Pilgrim Church."' Dr. Cheever's work, "The Pilgrim Fathers," gives a tolerable outline of the history of the successive Puritan migrations noticed in the text of the Lecture.

Page 284, *line* 20. 'The artist yet loves to dwell on the parting from Delph-haven.' Of course, I am alluding to the well-known picture by Mr. C. W. Cope, R.A. exhibited in the Royal Academy in 1857, under the title, "The Pilgrim Fathers: Departure of a Puritan Family for New England." The passage quoted by him as a comment is an extract from Governor Bradford's Journal, and will be found in Cheever, p. 11. Mr. Cope has since reproduced his picture as a *fresco*, in the New Palace at Westminster. Longfellow, in his "Courtship of Miles Standish," has transferred Governor Bradford's description to the occasion of the *May-Flower's* return homeward:—

"Men, and women, and children, all hurrying down to the sea-shore,
Eager, with tearful eyes, to say farewell to the May-Flower,

Homeward bound o'er the sea, and leaving them here in the desert.

* * * * * * *

Then, as if filled with the spirit, and wrapt in a vision prophetic,
Baring his hoary head, the excellent Elder of Plymouth
Said, 'Let us pray!' and they prayed, and thanked the Lord, and took courage."

Page 285, *line* 1. 'William Blackstone.' See Cheever, p. 243.

Page 285, *line* 5. 'Rules said to have been drawn up by John Cotton,' &c.

The specimens of Puritanic legislation, given under this description, are taken from Mr. Cox's "Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties," p. 562; to which I have been occasionally indebted, though the view contained in it differs materially from my own. He adds two more in the same place:—

"No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or Fasting Day.

"If any man shall kiss his wife, or wife her husband, on the Lord's Day, the party in fault shall be punished at the discretion of the magistrates."

As Mr. Cox did not give his grounds for believing them to be genuine, beyond referring to a tract entitled "The Whole Doctrine of the Sabbath," &c. by J. W., Edinb. 1851, I wrote him on the subject. The following is his obliging reply:—

"When visiting New England some years ago, I took pains to ascertain whether the laws quoted on p. 562 of 'Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties' are genuine; and I found them in a volume entitled 'The Blue Laws of New Haven Colony, usually called Blue Laws of Connecticut, &c. Compiled by an Antiquarian. Hartford, 1838.' By an antiquarian friend at Boston I was informed that the volume was compiled by Mr. R. R. Hinman, of Hartford.

"The Code drawn up by Governor Eaton for New Haven Colony in 1656 (of which Mr. Hinman gives 'a brief compilation' in pp. 125–130 of his book) contains the following articles:—

"'28. Whosoever shall profane the Lord's Day, or any part of it, by work or sport, shall be punished by fine, or corporally. But if the court, by clear evidence, find that the sin was *proudly, presumptuously*, and with a *high hand*, committed against the

command and authority of the *Blessed God*, such person therein despising and reproaching the Lord shall be put to *death*. Num. xv. from 30 to 36 verse.' (Hinman, p. 128.)

"'38. If any man shall kiss his wife, or wife kiss her husband, on the Lord's Day, the party in fault shall be punished at the discretion of the Court of Magistrates.' (Hinman, p. 130.)

"Hinman gives another body of Blue Laws collected from Peters's 'Hist. of Connecticut' and Barber's book with the same title. From this I quote the following:—

"'21. No one shall run on the Sabbath Day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting.' (Barber.)

"'22. No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave, on the Sabbath Day.' (Barber.)

"'23. No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or fasting day.' (Barber.)

"'24. The Sabbath shall begin at sunset on Saturday.' (Hinman, p. 122.)

"Hinman is distrustful of Peters, who, I believe, wrote during the American War of Independence on the loyalist side, and who, according to Hinman, added to the laws he took from Governor Eaton's Code 'some disgraceful laws, to stigmatize the inhabitants of the Colony, which appears to have been his object throughout his whole history' (p. 125). Barber, he supposes, had no better authority than that of Peters (*ib.*).

"On the whole, I do not implicitly receive as genuine any of these articles, except the two quoted from Governor Eaton's Code. But the others are so accordant with these, and with what we otherwise know of the practices of the colonists, that they are probably as genuine as the former.—P. 130.

"Captain Marryat, in his 'Diary in America,' 1839, vol. i. pp. 255–6, gives the 2d, 3d, 4th and 5th laws quoted by me (S. L. p. 562) as the 17th, 18th and 19th Articles of the Blue Laws of Connecticut. Some expressions vary from those in the copy quoted by me from J. W.

"J. W. is John Wauchope of Edinburgh, who died some years ago. His tract is not a scholarly production. I asked him where he got the laws, and he could only guess that it was from Marryat. But Marryat has not the paragraph commencing 'Whoever shall profane,' &c., and does not ascribe the laws to

Cotton, who, however, is likely to have proposed similar laws. He certainly did propose one of them; for Hutchinson, in his 'History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay' (Lond. 1765), states that in the first draught of the Laws of the Colony, by Cotton, not only murder, witchcraft, arson, blasphemy, &c. were made capital offences, but also 'profaning the Lord's Day, in a careless or scornful neglect or contempt thereof.' Governor Winthrop, however, erased the punishment of death for Sabbath-breaking, and for several of the other offences, leaving to the discretion of the Court the infliction of any minor punishment. (Vol. i. p. 442; see also pp. 161, 173, 193, 215.) Hutchinson mentions another law, by which Cotton and his friends desired to restrain people from walking in the streets or fields on the Lord's Day. Exception was taken to it in England, 'but, although,' says the historian, 'their charter was in danger, they refused to make any alteration in the law.'—P. 443.

"Among the capital laws of the Colony of New Plymouth, as revised in A.D. 1671, presumptuous Sabbath-breaking stands as an offence for which the perpetrators 'shall be put to death, or grievously punished at the judgment of the Court.'—*Hinman's Blue Laws*, &c. p. 55.

"I am not aware that under these laws any American Sabbath-breaker was ever put to death. Even in the Jewish history we have but the solitary instance of the man who gathered sticks in the wilderness during the life of Moses."

A work called "American Photographs," by J. M. G. and M. Turnbull, gives an account of "the Pilgrim Fathers," and specimens of their legislation; but the authors do not seem to have had any other authorities than those given above by Mr. Cox.

Page 286, *line* 5. 'The Pilgrim bands,' &c. Bryant. "The Burial Place," a Fragment.

Page 286, *line* 10. 'Macaulay.' "History of England," c. i. vol. i. pp. 79—81, fifth edition. The continuation of the passage quoted is a most powerful enlargement upon the general tone and manners of the Puritans.

Page 287, *line* 4. 'In consistency a Sabbatarian must keep his Sabbath on Saturday.'

Accounts of John Traske, and his opinions, will be found in Fuller's "Church History," vol. v. pp. 459, 460; in Pagitt's "Heresiography," pp. 135, 136, London, 1648; and in the

introduction by the Oxford Editor to Bp. Andrewes' sentence upon him in the Star-Chamber, (Minor Works, p. 83). He afterwards made a formal recantation of his opinions, Dec. 1, 1619. Fuller says that he lapsed into other heresies; but from a tract which he published the next year, called "Liberty from Judaism," which is noticed by Mr. Brewer, this would seem very unlikely. One of his disciples, named Hamlet Jackson, afterwards became a convert to actual Judaism.

Theophilus Brabourne is noticed in Fuller, vol. vi. p. 88, in Wood's "Athenæ Oxon." ii. 541; and in Bp. F. White's preface to his "Treatise of the Sabbath Day," written in refutation of his second book. But Brabourne wrote afterwards; and a composition of his against Cawdrey, which came out in 1654, gives no evidence of sincerity of retractation.

Various Saturday-Sabbatarian writers, besides Traske and Brabourne, preceded Thomas Bampfield, who was almost the last of them. Among them may be named Edward Stennets, H. Soursby, M. Smiths, and William Sellers, who wrote against Dean Owen. Bampfield and Stennets each brought out two books on the subject.

Puller, in his "Moderation of the Church of England," p. 159, quotes a curious passage from Erasmus, which seems to have been a continental foreshadowing of Traske's and Brabourne's views.

"Audimus apud Bohemos exoriri novum Judæorum genus, Sabbatarios appellant qui tantâ superstitione observant Sabbatum, ut si quid eo die inciderit in oculum, nolint eximere, quasi non sufficiat eis pro Sabbato dies Dominicus, qui Apostolis etiam erat sacer, aut quasi Christus non satis expresserit, quantum tribundum sit Sabbato."—*Erasm. de amab. Concord. col.* 506.

This somewhat reminds one of the Dositheans among the Jews, of whom Origen speaks: ἄλλοι δὲ, ὧν ἐστι Δοσίθεος ὁ Σαμαρεὺς, οἴονται ἐπὶ τοῦ σχήματος, οὗ ἂν καταληφθῇ τις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου, μένειν μέχρις ἑσπέρας. In other words, they interpreted 'abide ye every man in his place' so literally and rigorously, as that whatever habit, place, or posture a man was found in on the Sabbath-day, he was to continue in it all that day; if he was found sitting, he must sit still all the day; or if lying down, he must lie all the day. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. XX. 2. § 3, and Origen. περὶ ἀρχῶν iv. c. 19, whom he quotes.

Page 288, *line* 7. Bp. F. White was answered by an anonymous pamphlet, printed 1636, entitled "The Lord's Day the Sabbath Day.". It is "digested dialogue-wise between two divines, A. and B."

Page 288, *line* 25. 'A multitude of Sabbatarian writers.' As the following: Richard Greenham, whom Fuller speaks of, (vol. v. p. 193), "as a great advancer of the strict observance of the Lord's Day by that treatise which he wrote of the Sabbath;" (he died in A.D. 1592): Richard Byfield, who wrote "The Doctrine of the Sabbath Vindicated," against Edward Brerewood: and Isaac Marlow, whose "Tract on the Sabbath Day" was intended as a refutation of the Saturday-Sabbatarianism of Thomas Bampfield.

Page 289, *line* 6. 'At what exact hours does the Lord's Day commence and conclude?' Richard Baxter, so it seems to me, has given a common-sense answer to the former of these questions, and rendered it unnecessary to touch upon the latter. He says (Divine Appt. p. 91), "If we can tell when any day beginneth, we may know when the Lord's Day beginneth. If we cannot, the necessity of our ignorance will shorten the trouble of our scruples by excusing us.

"Because the Lord's Day is not to be kept as a Jewish Sabbath ceremoniously, but the time and the rest are here commanded subserviently for the work sake; therefore we have not so much reason to be scrupulous about the hours of beginning and ending, as the Jews had about their Sabbath."

The curious points raised about mariners losing a day in their reckoning are discussed in Isaac Marlow's pamphlet. They are frequently alluded to by writers of the period. See also Abp. Whately, "Thoughts on the Sabbath," p. 5. The difficulty was, of course, caused by a neglect to alter the reckoning day by day. It may make against the doctrine that the Jewish Sabbath, instituted for one country, is intended to prevail over the whole world. But it cannot make against the doctrine that the first day of the week, observed in Apostolic times in various places, according to the longitude of each place, without any question being agitated about it, is binding upon mankind.

Mr. Ellis, the author of "Polynesian Researches," tells me that some time ago the inhabitants of Tahiti and of the Society Islands, only about seventy or eighty miles asunder, observed

the Lord's Day on different days. A mistake originally made had been corrected in one case, but not in the other.

The "Polemical Dissertation of the Inchoation and Determination of the Lord's Day Sabbath," by W. Prynne, was written to prove that the Lord's Day begins on the Saturday evening.

Page 289, *line* 11. 'Thomas Broad,' or Brodæus; see his "Tractatus de Sabbato." 'Edward Brerewood;' see his "Two Treatises of the Sabbath." 'Christopher Dow;' see his "Discourse of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day." 'David Primerose;' see his work, entitled, "Of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day."

Page 289, *line* 17. 'Bp. Stillingfleet.' "Irenicon," Part i. c. i. § 6, p. 19.

Page 290, *line* 1. 'Laud's contention,' &c. Fuller's Church Hist. vol. vi. pp. 95, seq.

Page 290, *line* 3. 'Daniel Neale's unfair representation,' &c. See "Hist. of the Puritans," vol. ii. p. 238.

Page 290, *line* 8. 'The Theological decisions of Peers and Commons.'

Among the theological achievements of the House of Lords at this time, Jan. A.D. 1641, was the arraignment of Dr. Pocklington, and condemnation of his Visitation Sermon. It appears that he refused to recant, and was deprived of his preferments. But see a curious tract, entitled "The Petition and Articles on several Charges exhibited in Parliament against John Pocklington, D.D." &c. London, 1641.

As for the Commons, the following anecdote is given by Disraeli, "Charles I." vol. ii. p. 20. "It was on the occasion of a bill 'for the Better Observance of the Sabbath, commonly called Sunday,' we learn from a private letter of the day, that a member of the House presuming to sneer at the Puritans, observed that if Saturday was *dies Sabbati*, (as the journals of the House termed it), it might be entitled a bill 'for the observance of Saturday, commonly called Sunday.' Our unlucky wit had the good fortune only to be expelled the House."

Page 290, *line* 14. 'That no religious day whatever,' &c. See Lecture I. page 6, line 7, and note there.

Page 290, *line* 17. 'Meanwhile, in Scotland,' &c.

The first three of the examples given are quoted from Mr. Cox's "Sabbath Laws," &c. pp. 310, 311; the fourth from *Fraser's Magazine*, May, 1859.

Page 292, *line* 17. 'The fifty-sixth,' &c. See "MS. Book of Common Prayer for Ireland," edited by Mr. A. J. Stephens, Q.C., (for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1849, vol. i. Introd. pp. xxxvii.—lxxiii.), for a copy of the Irish Articles, and for a learned and interesting account of their origin, tendency, and final superseding. See also a note by the Oxford editor to Abp. Bramhall's "Discourse on the Sabbath," &c. Works, vol. v. p. 80.

* *Page* 293, *line* 27. "The language of Canaan." Bp. Jer. Taylor. "Sermon preached at the Funeral of the Lord Primate." Works, vol. vi. p. 321, Heber's Edit. 1828, quoted by Mr. A. J. Stephens.

Page 294, *line* 16. 'Earl Stanhope.' See his "History of England," c. xix. where he quotes the "Life of the Rev. William Grimshaw, p. 43."

Page 295, *line* 22. 'Abp. Whately.' For this passage, see his "Remarks," &c. p. 4.

Page 296, *line* 19. 'To meet the prevailing license . . . by a directly Divine precept.'

Bp. Horsley notices very strongly the prevailing habit of travelling on the Lord's Day.

Page 296, *line* 28. 'Richard Cecil.' See his "Remains," p. 336.

Page 296, *line* 29. 'Charles Simeon.' See his Life, pp. 292—294.

Page 299, *line* 24. 'The strictness of a Scottish Sunday, which Dr. Chalmers deprecated,' &c.

"Certain it is that the Sabbath Day may be made to wear an aspect of great gloom and great ungainliness, with each hour having its own irksome punctuality attached to it; and when the weary formalist, labouring to acquit himself in full tale and measure of all his manifold observations, is either sorely fatigued in the work of filling up the unvaried routine, or is sorely oppressed in conscience, should there be the slightest encroachment either on its regularity or on its entireness. We may follow him through his Sabbath history, and mark how, in the spirit of bondage, this dri velling slave plies at an unceasing task, to which, all the while, there is a secret dissatisfaction in his own bosom, and with which he lays an intolerable penance on his whole family. He is clothed in the habiliments of seriousness, and holds out the aspect of it; but never was aspect more unpromising or more unlovely. And, in

this very character of severity, is it possible for him to move through all the stages of Sabbath observancy—first, to eke out his morning hour of solitary devotion; and then to assemble his household to the psalms, and the readings, and the prayers, which are all set forth in due and regular celebration; and then, with stern parental authority, to muster, in full attendance for church, all the children and domestics who belong to him; and then, in his compressed and crowded pew, to hold out, in complete array, the demureness of spirit that sits upon his own countenance, and the demureness of constraint that sits on the general face of his family; and then, to follow up the public services of the day by an evening, the reigning expression of which shall be that of strict, unbending austerity, when the exercises of patience, and the exercises of memory, and a confinement that must not be broken from even for the tempting air and beauty of a garden, and the manifold other interdicts that are laid on the vivacity of childhood, may truly turn every Sabbath as it comes round into a periodical season of sufferance and dejection. And thus, instead of being a preparation of love and joy for a heaven of its own likeness, may all these proprieties be discharged for no other purpose than that of pacifying the jealousies of a God of vengeance, and working out a burdensome acquittal from the exactions of this hard and unrelenting task-master."—*Congregational Sermons.* Sermon XIII. vol. ii. pp. 274, 275.

After thus describing the "Sabbath drudge," as he calls this person, Dr. Chalmers next gives a sketch of the person whom he calls the "Sabbath amateur," pp. 277, 278, from which the passage quoted in the text of the Lecture is taken.

Page 300, *line* 2. 'A few words,' &c. I subjoin a large portion of my friend's letter. An experience of Scotland for nearly six years has enabled him to speak with authority.

"The outward aspect of Sunday in Scotland is marked by extreme strictness. Statistics prove, however, I believe, that the number of those who do not go to any place of worship is about the same as in England, namely, one-third of the entire population.

"It is held to be sinful to play on an instrument, as the piano, even the most sacred music. In many towns, a house where this rule was infringed would be mobbed; and great persons have been known to give way to the prejudices of their

servants, and keep the piano shut, not only in Scotland, but in London.

"The strictest Presbyterians teach that a walk on Sunday is unlawful. One distinguished minister of the Free Kirk openly avows his wish to see the interference of the police to prevent Sunday walks. I have known a respectable person, engaged in an Edinburgh poorhouse, whose occupations prevented her from getting a walk, (save very rarely), in the week. She did not dare to do so on Sundays, because of the scandal. Her position, in this respect, must be that of thousands.

"Now, unless these restrictions upon Christian liberty can be strictly proved to be enjoined by the law of God, they must do harm in many ways.

"1. They tend, I fear, to make many people hate religion. If this be Christianity, is their not unnatural feeling, what an iron yoke it is! Its commandments *are* grievous.

"2. They encourage Pharisaism and hypocrisy. To sit in the social circle, and discuss ones neighbours, creates no scandal; to sing a chorus from the 'Messiah,' with the accompaniment of a piano, is wickedness; to remain at home, with closed windows, during service time, and read any kind of book, can be managed without offence; but any out-door pursuit is put down.

"3. They encourage drinking. A people thus constrained takes refuge in whisky. Whisky, (euphemistically termed refreshment), and sermons are, with many, alternate objects of attention. 'There is a great demand for drink on Sunday, and it *must* be supplied,' (evidence of Mr. Teacher, wholesale and retail spirit merchant, before the Commission on the Forbes Mackenzie Act, *Glasgow Daily Herald*, 12th August, 1859). A minister of the Establishment, in a town on the west coast, who had used all his influence, (with the very best and highest intentions), to stop any hiring of boats on Sunday, told a friend of the writer that he began to doubt whether the practical result was good, inasmuch as the non-kirk-goers stayed away just as much, and read light and even infidel books. The same minister mentioned that the proprietor of a house of refreshment, three miles off, had taken as much as 20*l.* for whisky on a single Sunday. This, at the ordinary rate of 6*d.* per glass, represents 800 glasses. The three miles' walk qualifies the purchasers to claim refreshment as travellers.

"Any one who looks into the *back* streets of Edinburgh on a Sunday, may observe much cleaning of flys, and like occupations. Another friend of the writer's inquired of the men on board a Clyde steamer, whether they went to kirk on Sunday. The reply was, 'No; they take care to give us too much work to do for that.' The men were occupied in cleaning the engines, &c. Similarly, there is reason to fear, that farm-servants, in many parts of Scotland, find great difficulty in getting to-kirk.

"My own impression is, that keeping up appearances is but far too common. Many people in Edinburgh contrive to obtain a walk by going to some place of worship as remote as possible from their homes. This saves *their* conscience; but it is surely a great injury to the conscience of others who do take a walk, to be doubting all the time whether they are not doing wrong."

Then follows a passage relating to the Debate which is spoken of in the next note.

Page 300, *line* 10. 'At a recent meeting of . . . the United Presbyterians.'

The following extract is taken from a report given in the *Scotsman*, Wednesday, Feb. 8, 1860, of the meeting of the "Edinburgh United Presbyterian Presbytery."

Dr. JOHNSTON, after some remarks, said—"There were multitudes of persons in the city, (meaning Edinburgh), who disregarded the Gospel, and their people were in danger of being led away by these people. He should deeply regret if ever the time should come when their people should employ themselves as even good people felt themselves at liberty to employ themselves on the Continent. He should never forget what he saw when he was in Strasbourg. He had a letter of recommendation to a gentleman in Strasbourg—a good man. He delivered his letter in the afternoon of the Lord's Day, and the servant told him that his master was out walking with his lady on the ramparts; and he found it was the common custom of the Christians in Strasbourg to walk on the ramparts.

"Mr. PARLANE, of Tranent—Why did you deliver the letter on that day?

"Dr. JOHNSTON—I can explain that, if it is necessary. It was a work of necessity."

A debate followed this, in the course of which Mr. JAMES HENDERSON (the elder) observed, in a much wiser tone, that

"they were all agreed as to certain forms of Sabbath desecration mentioned in the report; but there were others upon which there was a great difference of opinion. He referred especially to burying the dead upon that day. He could see nothing inconsistent with the sanctity of the Sabbath in attending to that solemn duty. No doubt the report did not go the length of saying that it was sinful, and certain reasons were given for its being right in some cases; but he thought there were other reasons besides those stated in the report. It was a well-known fact that a great proportion of the funerals on that day were those of the working classes, and it was natural that they should have a desire to ask their friends and acquaintances to attend the funeral of any member of their families. He thought they might desire to do so without being charged with pride—a remark in the report which he thought very unhappy indeed. It was well known that the working-man was not in a position to lose nearly half a day in attending funerals. He questioned much if any of them would be willing to lose half a day of their income for any such purpose. Certain ministers had stated that, in consequence of their conscientious feeling, they decline attending Sunday funerals; but his impression was that few members of the churches expected that ministers should attend on that day, because they had more important duties to perform. In his opinion, however, that was an argument showing the necessity of these people burying their dead on that day, because there was no time when a member had a greater desire to see his minister than upon such an occasion. It was suggested in the report that ministers, city missionaries, and elders should decline attending funerals on Sabbath Days. He trusted elders would never do anything of the kind. He should hope, if the report was to go forth, that that paragraph would be deleted; but if it should not, he trusted elders would set their face against it, and attend Sabbath Day funerals with greater regularity than formerly. As to the cab question, he thought every person must be left to decide on that question as they thought proper. He opposed shop traffic as much as any man, except such as might serve the purposes of necessity and mercy. As to Sabbath walking, he thought none of them would approve of walking during Divine service; but he could not see any sin in any of them rising before breakfast and taking a walk for half an hour.

They would be much better employed doing that than lying in their beds. (Laughter, and hear, hear.) And so too, in the evening, he never could bring his mind to think that it was sinful for a husband and wife, with their children, to take a walk on a Sunday evening, when they had been, perhaps, cooped up in a small house, with little air, all the week. It was very easy for members of committee, who had their large airy apartments—their drawing-room, dining-room, and every other convenience—to keep from Sabbath walking; but they must remember that many of the members of their churches were cooped up in small houses, where they could scarcely breathe the fresh air, and he never could bring his mind to believe that there was anything sinful in taking a quiet walk on a Sabbath evening. As to what had horrified Dr. Johnston on the Continent, he could not speak on that point; but he thought there was little difference between the minister taking a walk with his lady on the ramparts on a Sunday, and Dr. Johnston walking along the streets and delivering a letter of introduction on that holy day. (Laughter.) He could see no difference between the two, and if there was sin at all committed—if there was anything wrong, the greater sin was on the part of Dr. Johnston, in walking along the streets and delivering a letter of introduction to that minister on the Sabbath; that appeared to him to be a greater act of Sabbath desecration than the act of the minister and his lady in walking on the ramparts."

This caused a vehement discussion, Dr. Johnston repeating his assertion, that "his walking was a matter of necessity." No doubt this was so, but it did not alter the case; for Mr. Henderson's argument implied that he considered that there was no sin in the walk of either of the two parties. The debate was further remarkable for an assertion on the part of Mr. MUSHET, that Calvin's opinion had been against "the obligation of the Sabbath." Dr. PEDDIE answered him, not by a denial that Calvin thought thus, (this was impossible), but by the following words: "Calvin is not the standard of this Church, but the 'Shorter Catechism.'"

LECTURE VIII.

Page 304, *line* 19. 'To convey no more than is conveyed in such words as the following.'

Dr. Pusey in his note upon p. 391, n. e. of Ephrem's Homilies, by Morris, after going through many of the passages in the early Fathers, in which the Sabbath and the Lord's Day are mentioned, concludes thus: "It is evident from this examination that the Fathers (1) spoke absolutely of the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath; (2) that they did not speak of the Lord's Day as being a transfer of it; (3) yet that they do speak of it as an Apostolic ordinance; and (4) as a substitution for it, displacing it; (5) that abstinence from business on the Lord's Day, as a religious duty, was an early universal tradition; and (6) enforced by the laws of the Church. According to that larger acceptation of the Ten Commandments, whereby they contain the summary of all moral duty, as the sixth forbids anger or spiritual murder, or the seventh all uncleanness, so the fourth enjoins the hallowing of all days appointed by authority, whether Apostolic or the Church. And of these the Lord's Day, of course, with the great festivals of our Lord, holds the highest place; so that it is still the chief object and intent of the Fourth Commandment. The Ten Commandments, placed at the commencement of Alfred's code, are a testimony to the ninth century."

Dr. Pusey has enlarged the number of centuries from which he derives his view, and has consequently raised other festivals more nearly to the rank of the Lord's Day than I have found reason to do. But his six heads very nearly agree with the conclusions to which I have arrived in these Lectures. I am anxious, while mentioning his name, to quote his opinion also upon an assertion sometimes made, that "the Fathers speak commonly, as if the whole principle of observing one day more than another was Jewish and blameable."

He says then, in the same note, "This statement seems too broad. The Fathers seem to me only to *apply* the language of Holy Scripture (Col. ii. 16), which speaks of the Jewish Sabbath as something past, 'a shadow of things to come;' and Heb. iv. 10, which points out, whereof it was a figure, the rest in Christ,

'There remaineth yet a keeping of a Sabbath, E. M. (σαββατισμὸς) to the people of God,' of which resting from sin is a part and a condition. The Lord's Day was kept from the time of the Apostles, and consequently, the Fathers could not have meant to condemn 'the principle of observing one day more than another,' under which they themselves were acting. Rather there was the less risk in speaking broadly of the cessation of the Jewish Sabbath, or of the rest from sin, or of our eternal rest, as its spiritual meaning, without any mention of the Lord's Day, because the Lord's Day was an Apostolic ordinance, everywhere observed as a chief part of Christian devotion, and which therefore could not be meant to be disparaged."

Page 305, *line* 8. 'A sacrifice of renunciation.'

"Der lezte Tag soll der Ruhe geweihet seyn: alle gewöhnlichen Arbeiten der Menschen sollen an ihm aufhören, eine auszerordentliche Stille eintreten. De soll also der Mensch auch auf den Gewinn und Genuss verzichten den er durch sein gewöhnliches Treiben und Arbeiten sucht: dies ist das *Entsagungs-Opfer* welches er hier bringen muss, ein ganz anderes als alle die Opfer der vorigen Welt, aber ein für den Menschen, gewinnsüchtig oder sonstwie in das Gewirre der Welt versunken wie er ist, oft gar nicht so leichtes."—*Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel, von H. Ewald.*

Page 309, *line* 23. 'But sobriety is not sadness, still less is it abstinence and mortification.'

Compare "Ut in vitâ, sic in studiis, pulcherrimum et humanissimum existimo, severitatem comitatemque miscere, ne illa in tristitiam, hæc in petulantiam procedat."

Page 309, *line* 27. 'That according to the poet's words, "Vegeti præscripta ad munia surgant," on the Monday.' Though it is far from being merely a renewal of strength, it *is* this, as Macaulay well puts it in his speech on the Ten Hours' Bill. (Speeches, corrected by himself, p. 453.) "The natural difference between Campania and Spitzbergen is trifling when compared with the difference between a country inhabited by men full of bodily and mental vigour, and a country inhabited by men sunk in bodily and mental decrepitude. Therefore it is that we are not poorer but richer, because we have, through many ages, rested from our labour one day in seven. That day is not lost. While industry is suspended, while the plough lies in the

furrow, while the exchange is silent, while no smoke ascends from the factory, a process is going on quite as important to the wealth of nations as any process which is performed on more busy days. Man, the machine of machines—the machine compared with which all the contrivances of the Watts and Arkwrights are worthless—is repairing and winding up, so that he returns to his labours on the Monday with clearer intellect, with livelier spirits, with renewed corporal vigour."

Page 310, *line* 22. 'Bp. Prideaux.' The passage in the text is taken from a translation of the Bishop's "Oratio Septima—De Sabbato," p. 36, Second Edit. London, 1634.

Page 315, *line* ult. 'A certain Bill which has just passed the House of Lords.' It has since been withdrawn in the Commons; but I have not felt at liberty to recall the remarks in the text, which seemed to me to describe its tendency not inaccurately. It differed from nearly all existing Acts in this respect: *they* were of the nature of special prohibitions, of the exercise of certain trades, professions, &c. in support of the sanctity of the day, when invaded by bodies of men too strong for the common law of the State and of the Church. And, whatever they forbade, (of course, with a few exceptions implied), they forbade throughout the day, thus recognising the principle that it is the Lord's Day. But *this* Bill appeared to give up that principle, and to make it lawful to large classes of tradesmen to traffic on that day, as if it were a week-day, with the arbitrary reservation, in some cases, of the hours after ten, in others of from ten to one only. And it appeared also to render it possible by a little management, for many tradesmen not intended by its provisions, to avail themselves of them, by nominally classing themselves amongst those intended, *i.e.* by selling what they sold in addition to their own articles.

The only plausible arguments that were urged in favor of the Bill were, that the law as at present existing was defied; and that it is better to have a law, (though a bad one), kept, than a good law neglected and inoperative. (Conf. Arist. Rhet. I. 15. 12).

To these it was replied, that to give up a good law, because it is at present inoperative, shows great faint-heartedness, and distrust in moral and missionary influences, which, perhaps, have never yet been fairly brought to bear; that sanitary measures and attempts to better the condition of the poor are yet in their infancy; and that, the high ground of the sanctity of the day

once abandoned by the State, not merely would many persons, now restrained by the secondary motive of regard of the law, be tempted to traffic on the Lord's Day, but it would be almost impossible to make the poor understand that that was objectionable which their betters, (for so they would call the Legislature), permitted.

The pernicious tendency of the Bill escaped the notice of one of the chief London Societies specially interested in the subject, "The Metropolitan Rest Association," and they were induced to support it; but "The Society for Promoting the Due Observance of the Lord's Day" discovered its character at once, and issued most energetic protests against it. I may not agree with that Society as to the grounds on which the Lord's Day is of Divine obligation, or indeed as to the degree and manner in which it is to be observed, but I greatly respect their zeal, and sympathise with them in their main object, the upholding the sanctity of this DIVINE INSTITUTION. I subjoin a portion of a Memorial presented by them to the Secretary of State, which I found very useful in clearing my own view of the tendency of the Bill.

"We do not wish to call in question the intentions of the framers and supporters of the above-mentioned Bill, while we are persuaded that its principle is unsound and that many of its clauses are dangerous. In all former legislation on the Lord's Day, the Divine authority for its religious observance has been made the ground of right to make that penal on this day, which in itself and on other days is lawful. This Bill, from first to last, ignores this truth, thus making mere civil expediency the basis of coercive statutes. All former exceptions from the legal penalties incurred by trading on the Lord's Day have been made upon the assumption of their necessity, as being articles of food quickly perishable, medicines, or else as being required by travellers. This Bill proposes openly to legalize the sale of articles—as for instance, periodical publications and newspapers, as well as confectionery—on all hours of the Lord's Day, save from ten to one o'clock, the sale of which cannot be said to be called for either by necessity, charity, or piety.

* * * * * * *

"We also submit that the arbitrary distinctions of this Bill will be sure to create discontent, which will have to be allayed by similar concessions to other branches of trade. For example:

Should this Bill become law, pastrycooks may traffic in their commodities on all hours of the Lord's Day, save from ten to one o'clock. Grocers, however, who keep many of the same articles, will be fined if they sell them. The booksellers of London, in the same hours, may sell any work whatsoever, even though it be of a demoralising tendency, provided it be issued in parts or numbers: if they sell the same work as a complete book, they are liable to a penalty. The tobacconist who should hand over the counter any of his articles to a customer, may be summoned for a breach of the statute, while his neighbour the publican may sell tobacco because he also sells beer. The question of selling or not selling on the Lord's Day will thus be removed from its present grounds: it will become a matter of justice or injustice. It will be asked, If one may sell, why may not another?—if periodicals, why not books?—if books, why not clothes?

"Nor is this all. As this Bill, should it become law, will clash with former statutes now in force—as the Act of Charles II.—it has already been intimated that such statutes will, in such case, have to be repealed, thus leaving no legislative witness and keeper of the Lord's Day, save this Bill of arbitrary distinctions.

"We have been glad to learn that, as the moral feeling of the community has improved, and support has been afforded by a large proportion of the trading classes themselves, the present laws against trading on the Lord's Day have of late, in certain towns, been successfully appealed to, and in some instances enforced, although their penalties are almost nominal. And we think it would be safer that there should be no legislation in this direction, until the mind of the country be ripe for a sound and fair measure, than now purchase a partial and doubtful success by ignoring that authority which should be the basis of such legislation. We therefore pray you, as one of her Majesty's Secretaries of State, to use your influence with the Government and Parliament to prevent this Bill becoming law; that the example and sanction of the Legislature may not be afforded for the legalising and upholding of unnecessary trading on the Lord's Day.'

My own opinion I have endeavoured to express in pp. 317, 318 of the text. Legislatively, I would at present do nothing;

but, under the Divine blessing, a great deal may be done without legislation. What has recently transpired at Birmingham is an evidence of this. And neighbourhoods become observant of the Lord's Day in proportion to the missionary and philanthropic agencies which are brought to bear upon them morally and physically.

Page 318, *line* 19. 'So, again, with respect to travelling.' I do not know that I can add anything to what has been already said in the text of the Lecture on this point. It will be obvious to any candid reader that I am most anxious that all, if possible, should rest on the Lord's Day from their labours, whether the driver of a cab, or the clerk or stoker on a railway. But I cannot help looking at such matters practically, and should therefore deprecate any such interference with travelling as has been attempted in Scotland.

Page 321, *line* 6. 'By providing parks and similar open spaces.' I do not think this advantage can be too widely extended. Let those who are inclined to disbelieve its benefits, or to distrust the behaviour of the multitude, visit the Victoria Park at the east end of London in the afternoon of a Sunday in summer.

Page 322, *line* 20. 'A design of getting rid of the religious character of the day.' See, on this subject, "The People's Day; or, An Appeal to Lord Stanley, M.P. against his Advocacy of a French Sunday," by William Arthur, A.M. I quote this again in pp. 324, 325. I do not, of course, agree with the ground that it takes for the obligation of the Lord's Day, and I should object to other points in it. But it is powerfully written and very suggestive.

Page 325, *line* 2. 'The demonstration' alluded to was on the occasion of the introduction of Lord R. Grosvenor's (now Lord Ebury) Bill in 1855, 1856. The passage quoted in the text is from Mr. Arthur's pamphlet, pp. 46, 47.

Page 326, *line* 2. 'Charitable allowance for each other's circumstances.' Dr. Chalmers has a very beautiful Sermon on "The Accommodating Spirit of Christian Charity," Congreg. Serms. Vol. II. Serm. XV. in which this principle is advocated. Among other points which come under his notice, is the duty of not doing violence to the religious feelings of the nation in which one is staying for a season, by any act which to ones own

conscience, and in ones own country, appears perfectly harmless. As an instance of this, he quotes the example of Wilberforce. When at home he could, and did without scruple, enjoy exercise and God's fresh air on Sunday; but when in Scotland he was so careful of offending the scruples of the Scotch, that he carefully shut himself up in his inn for the whole of the day except during church-time.

Page 327, *line* 18. 'Very little of such legislation,' &c. "A Summary of the Statutes for the Observance of the Lord's Day" has been drawn up and circulated by "The Society for Promoting the Due Observance of the Lord's Day." But the reader is referred to the work of Mr. E. V. Neale for a full account of English legislation on the subject, which has been put together and commented upon with much learning and research—"Feasts and Fasts."

Page 328, *line* 1. 'Mr. J. S. Mill.' "On Liberty," c. iv. pp. 161–163.

Page 330, *line* 20. 'By administering the Holy Communion in the afternoon or evening;' and again, 'What insuperable objection there can be to this I cannot conceive.' I observed in Lecture II. p. 35, l. 4, that I conceived that "such things connected with the celebration of the Holy Communion as do not actually occur in Scripture, and so are not of the essence of the Holy Communion, are to be considered as matters not Divine, but simply and purely Ecclesiastical." And they are not even Ecclesiastical to any particular Church, unless that Church has laid down a rule respecting them.

I observed, too, in a note to the above passage, that thus "the time at which the Holy Eucharist is celebrated would, anywhere, come under the category of things purely Ecclesiastical." To us it is not even that; it is a matter indifferent: for, as it is not settled once for all in Holy Scripture, so our own Church has not thought it necessary to fix it by a special regulation. This, then, being the case, I believe that with us the Holy Eucharist may be celebrated at any hour which may be found most to edification, subject of course to the "godly admonition" of the Bishop under which a priest or a parish may be placed.

In England a feeling has long been growing up that the present hour for the Holy Communion is anything but universally convenient. Appended as the Office for it is to those

of Morning Prayer and Litany united, and containing the Sermon within its limits, it is fatiguing to all, especially where there are many communicants. It taxes the attention of all, especially of the poor, to a most unwise extent. And not merely so; but as it occurs exactly at the dinner-hour of a very large class of persons, and after a service which many are necessarily unable to attend, difficulties which cannot be ignored too often prevent its reception. Hence a very prevalent disregard of it; and hence, also, a forgetfulness of the real character of the Lord's Day, which is intimately connected with the reception of the Lord's Supper.

This state of things being very unsatisfactory, the next question is, What is to be done? Every one is theoretically agreed that the present time of celebration has little but prescription to recommend it; and that it has gained that prescription in consequence, partly of the general alteration of habits, especially in towns, from earlier to later rising, partly of the somewhat slovenly custom which was not unusual in the Church of Rome, of taking distinct offices in close sequence, and, in fact, running them into each other. Inconvenient, however, and undetermined by Church law as the present hour is, it need not, for all that, be abandoned everywhere, or at once. It may be retained, where desired, either with or without a celebration for others, at some more convenient hour of the day. This might, at any rate, satisfy those who like things as they are. But the difficulty is not yet quite got over. If the hour of celebrating the Holy Communion is to be shifted, it must be either to an earlier hour than at present, or to a later hour. Those who would shift it to an earlier hour put it generally very early indeed, and plead primitive practice, and the desirableness of communicating fasting, and certain strong phrases on the subject which may be quoted from ancient (though not the most ancient) Christian writers, and the danger of profaning it if taken after *the meal* of the day. Those who would shift it to a later hour deny the primitive practice, or deny that it is binding in defect of any intimation in Holy Scripture on the subject, or, if pressed over much, sometimes turn round upon their opponents with the remark, "If Scripture is to be quoted at all, it seems rather in our favor than in yours, for the Eucharist was instituted in the evening." But generally, they hold so strongly that "the Holy Communion was made for man,

and not man for the Holy Communion," that they are willing to celebrate it at any hour, in the morning early, at midday, in the afternoon, or in the evening, as may be found most suitable and most merciful, the circumstances of their flocks considered.

I would say a word upon each of these views; and first of the early view. It is usually acknowledged by its upholders, that, for some time, at least, the Church did not make any rule whatever on the subject; an admission which seems almost to settle the allegation of primitive practice. No hint is found on the subject in the earliest Fathers; and though, (which I am inclined to do), we allow that the *Sacramentum* of Pliny, which was taken at the Christian assemblies, *ante lucem*, was the Holy Eucharist, this point has to be explained; Was the early meeting, or early Communion, a matter of religion at all? Was it not rather a matter of necessity? May not the same necessity which obliged Christians to choose as *places* of celebration the most secluded spots, and sometimes even cemeteries, have obliged them to choose a *time* also when persecution should be asleep? As for the Christian writers of the second century, Justin, if I mistake not, does not insist upon any particular time, though he describes with some exactness the service of the Lord's Day, including the celebration of the Eucharist. Tertullian, whose date must be placed at its termination, has indeed something which seems to bear upon it. But as the three places generally cited are either susceptible of various interpretations, or else refer to special cases, I do not dwell upon them. (I allude to *De Oratione*, c. xiv.; *De Coronâ Militis*, c. ix.; and *Ad Uxorem*, lib. ii. c. v. The notes in Rigaltius' edition are worth consulting.) Were they free from any exception, I should still venture to doubt whether, without connecting links, they are sufficient to prove that the custom of early Communions was a primitive ecclesiastical ordinance. And this would apply yet more strongly to the language of Cyprian in the latter half of the third century, even if that language would bear the meaning which has sometimes been imposed upon it. But it will not bear it. For let us see what he says in his sixty-third *Epistle, To Cœcilius*, §§ 15, 16, 17. He is speaking of a class of persons called *Aquarii*, or such as used water only, instead of the mixed chalice, in the Holy Eucharist. But the *Aquarii* of his day were not those ordinarily so denominated, (as Bingham intimates, B. XV. c. ii.); but cowards in act,

rather than heretics in principle. They used water for the morning celebration, lest the smell of wine should betray them to the heathen; but in the evening they used the mixed chalice. And, when pressed with their inconsistency, instead of acknowledging their real reason, cowardice, they professed to be keeping closer to the hour of the original institution by celebrating in the evening.

Cyprian tells them that Christ's time, the evening, was prophetic and symbolical, and need not be considered strictly exemplary. He says that in the evening, celebrations must necessarily be private, for all cannot then be present; (the reason for this doubtless was the fear of attracting the notice of the heathen;) that *the resurrection of Christ* is commemorated in the morning, and as often as the Holy Supper takes place, (*quotiescunque*); and that *whenever it is* celebrated, it should be celebrated in all the circumstances essential to it. The Aquarii, in having only water in the morning, left out one very important circumstance, the wine, and so commemorated imperfectly.

Such is Cyprian's argument. There is not the slightest hint in it of *añ obligation* to morning celebration exclusively.

The two points urged are—"We cannot get the brethren together in the evening, but we can in the morning. Join us at that hour, and partake of the Holy Communion in the proper way." And—"Do not mutilate it by imperfect rites in the morning, which you adopt for fear of discovery, not really for conscience' sake. For observe, you adopt perfect rites in the evening, and thus negative your own plea of conscience. Remember the design of the institution; whenever it is celebrated —morning, evening, or *quotiescunque*—it is to be celebrated in its perfectness." The whole of the passage shows that the *calix mixtus* was what Cyprian was chiefly contending for, and that the question of *time*—an open one in itself—only became important because the body of believers could be got together more conveniently at one time than at another. This is especially evident from § 17. If, then, Cyprian's way of treating the subject is to assist either party, it must be the party which considers what time will get together most communicants. (I will only remark in passing, that if resort is had to Cyprian for the time as a matter of obligation, the mixed chalice must be adopted on his authority also. He insists upon that most strongly. But our

Church has not thought proper to follow him.) Cyprian, then, and Tertullian, being set aside as not in point, Augustine and Chrysostom, at the close of the fourth century, are undoubtedly the great patristical authorities on the subject. But Augustine thought it necessary to explain *why* the Holy Eucharist, instituted in the evening, did not take place in the evening. And Chrysostom uses language concerning it which defeats its purpose by its very exaggeration: "If I have done any such thing, (as administer to persons except fasting), let my name be blotted out of the roll of Bishops, nor be inscribed in the book of the Orthodox Faith; since, lo! if I have done any such thing, Christ also will cast me out of His kingdom." Our Church has adopted neither Augustine's reasoning, nor Chrysostom's scruples. As for what is said by the Third Council of Carthage and by the Council of Laodicea, the later Council, that of Carthage, rules differently from the former. And, even were their rulings in harmony, our own Church, which, in an indifferent matter, (standing on the Lord's Day at Divine Service), does not regard even an Œcumenical Council, is, in a matter to all appearance equally indifferent, not bound by Provincial Councils.

It is said, however, that there is danger of profaning the Holy Communion, if it is received after the chief meal of the day. Now, to whom does this apply? Surely not to the poor, for their chief meal on Sunday is, as I have observed in the text of the Lecture, not of the abundant character to create this apprehension, even if they communicate in the afternoon, and much less if they communicate in the evening. Many of the middle classes will continue to communicate at the time now usual. Many of those in easy circumstances and disengaged, and many who habitually rise early, will communicate early. As for the imaginary case of "Dives" quitting a dining-room where he has "fared sumptuously," and coming to church in an unfit condition to receive the Holy Communion, this is scarcely likely to occur. Even did it occur now and then, would this be a sufficient reason for depriving others of a blessing which he is wicked enough to misuse? And would the mere possibility of it, antecedent to a fair trial, justify the invention of a new epithet, "post-prandial," to stigmatize a late reception by many who come, perhaps, not when they would, but when they can? Let those who are inclined to adopt such an epithet go to St. James', Leeds; to

St. Martin's, Birmingham; or to St. Peter's, Stepney; they will see there many humble worshippers to whose condition as compared with ours might be applied Burke's description of the natives of India, persons "whose very excess and luxury, in their most plenteous days, falls short of our austerest fasts." At the last-named church, St. Peter's, I have myself officiated on an Easter Sunday evening. It was the third celebration on that day. One hundred and sixty communicated; I administered to eighty of these. There were not two of them whose hard hands and general appearance did not indicate the working man or woman.

The mistake of those who advocate the early Communion seems to be, that they do not merely urge it to be a desirable practice—this we might allow—but that they consider it to be the only practice which ought to prevail. They thus ignore difficulties created by poverty, by engagements, by health, and by a variety of other causes. This at least is avoided by those who argue for the later view. Generally, they concede that any time is lawful, and look to the practical objects of the institution, the strengthening and refreshing of the souls of believers. This they conceive more necessary to be kept in view than a mere Church regulation—if indeed it was such—which our own Church has not adopted. They have weighty arguments on their side—the present hour does not bring people to the Holy Communion; other hours do. In some neighbourhoods an early hour suits some; let them have it. In other neighbourhoods a later hour suits very, very many; let them have it also. Scripture and the silence of our Church have, they say, left the hour an open question. Why make it a close question? And if experience is wanted, cases are ready in abundance to show how the change of hours has worked.

I confess I incline to this liberal view, and in confirmation of it I subjoin extracts from letters by three well-known clergymen, of differing sentiments on some other matters, but agreeing thoroughly as to the happy result of the experiment which they have made.

The *first* extract is from a letter by the Rev. Dr. Miller, rector of St. Martin's, Birmingham. He treats incidentally of other matters connected with my subject, such as the division and alternation of Sunday services, and the importance of a distinct service for children. It bears date July 25, 1860.

"I find, on reference, that we began our evening Communion

in July, 1852. This was after the termination of our first experiments, which commenced in January of the same year, and included *early, midday,* and *afternoon* Communions.

"After the institution of the evening Communion we soon abandoned that in the afternoon, as unnecessary for the convenience of the communicants.

"The number of evening communicants has gradually increased, and includes all classes. Partly, no doubt, because time is not so important as in the morning, when every minute affects early family dinners and the afternoon attendance of servants. Partly because it suits Sunday-school teachers. To servants and many of the artisan class the evening is their only time for public worship.

"Our early service was an entire failure—in no measure from prejudice—only from the habits of the population. It suited no class. Most people take an extra rest on Sunday mornings, and servants cannot be spared so early.

"Generally, I may say, that I strongly recommend division of the services; and I think the *variety* on different Sundays an advantage. By so arranging, no one of the three congregations is deprived of any part of our Liturgy. Our afternoon and evening people sometimes join in Litany and Communion service, as well as in evening prayers; and they soon fall into the plan. The fancy that they will be in constant uncertainty is groundless. No inconvenience is felt, no complaints are made.

"Our Sunday morning service for our school children, in a separate building, and lasting an hour, is much liked by teachers and children.

"NUMBER OF COMMUNICANTS, 1860.

"*January* 1*st.*—Morning	Early . . . 32	Communion *thrice* on first Sunday in year.	
	Midday . . 121		
Evening	179		
8*th.*—Early	19		
February 5*th.*—Midday	79		
12*th.*—Early	42		
26*th.*—Evening	95		
March 4*th.*—Midday	74		
11*th.*—Early	45		
25*th.*—Evening	95		
April 1*st.*—Midday	42		
Good Friday, Midday .	64		

Easter Day, Early . .	73
Midday .	77
Evening .	179
May 6th.—Midday	66
Early	45
Ascension Day, Midday . .	26
Whit Sunday, Midday . . .	31
Evening . . .	152
June. Trinity Sunday, Midday . .	43
10*th.*—Early	33
24*th.*—Evening	89"

The *second* extract is from a letter by the Rev. T. J. Rowsell, the incumbent of St. Peter's, Stepney. It bears date July 25, 1860.

"I am at a distance from my journals, but I can remember the following facts about evening Communions:

"Since we adopted the practice, in addition to Communions at other hours, the number of communicants has increased at least one-fourth, if not one-third, and in the evening nearly all are poor. The few who are not, are often invalids, or those who have remained at home with those who are invalids—and some have been kind watchers by the sick, who can get out in the evening, though not earlier. About a quarter of the day's number attend in the evening, rather more than at the early Communion; the rest attend in the midday. Their manner is most devout, as you have seen, and the labouring poor often express gratitude for the opportunity. Our people dine early, at one; get tidy and quiet, and get their children to bed; their minds are at ease—and this is indeed the *Lord's Supper* to them: I am sure the Holy Gift is a sanctification to them, and it is always reverently accepted. I am not at all changed by anything that has been written against my practice: 1 Cor. xi., and he who wrote to them gives me liberty, and guards me against license. The souls of my people are dearer to me than discipline, thankful as I am for discipline when it *leads to*, not *keeps away from*, Christ. Surely *that* is the Church's spirit.

"There is no step in the last seventeen years which I took, at first, with more hesitation, but there is none which I now less regret. 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' is what one desires to learn, and to draw our poor to church with kindness and charity."

The *third* extract is from a letter by the Rev. Edward Jackson, the incumbent of St. James', Leeds. It bears date August 30, 1860.

"The practice of celebrating the Holy Communion in the evening commenced in Leeds in 1851.

"The question, along with others of a similar character, had been carefully considered by the Leeds clergy shortly before the practice was commenced, and it had been recommended as desirable by a committee of the Rural Deanery in a report published in October of that year.

"The first church in which evening Communion took place was one, situate in a populous suburb, principally occupied by the working classes; the next was my own, which is surrounded by a dense mass of the lowest grades of society; vagrants, hawkers, reputed thieves, and the poorest Irish.

"The practice was next introduced into the large parish church, by the vicar, Dr. Hook, but was in that church limited to the administration of the Communion in the evenings of such holy days and saints' days as did not fall on Sundays. It afterwards spread to several other churches, both in the town and the suburbs.

"I have now had a nine years experience of evening Communions, and therefore I may be allowed to speak with some confidence of results.

"And first I would say generally, that I have reason to be altogether satisfied with the practice, and to be most thankful that it was introduced into my church. I consider that it has tended more than anything else in connexion with our services to kindle and keep alive the spirit of true devotion, and the perseverance in holy living, as well as to foster a warm attachment to the place where the privileges were afforded, as indeed the house of God; all which is continually more evident.

"2. As regards numbers in attendance, the average at the evening celebrations has been more than double the average at Communions in the earlier part of the day; and at the evening Communions on saints' days and other holy days, the attendance has been fully equal to that on Sunday mornings, if not greater.

"I ought here to state, that it has been the custom in my church, since the year 1838, to have the Communion adminis-

tered every Lord's Day, and on all saints' days and holy days, for which there are special services appointed by the Church.

"Our hours for service are: On Sundays—Morning, 10.30, evening 6.30; and on saints' days and holy days, at 8 in the evening only, the service ending at 9.

"It is perhaps important also to remark, that on Sunday mornings, when the Communion is administered, the Litany is said in the evening, and not in the morning; and *vice versâ*, when the Communion takes place in the Evening Service, which is once in the month, the Litany is said at the Morning Service. The advantage of this arrangement in equalizing the respective duration of the two services is very considerable, both to the minister and the people.

"3. The convenience to the families of the working classes is so great, and I may say so necessary, that now it appears to me no longer any wonder that the greater part of our population is alienated from the Church, and that we have so few communicants from the masses of the poor. It cannot indeed be otherwise, when the services are so arranged as to time and circumstance, that the working people cannot avail themselves of them.

"For instance, how can a mother of the lower orders leave her house on Sunday, either to attend an ordinary service or to receive the Communion, so long as her children require her attendance and her care? It is obvious, that the only time for her is the evening, when the little ones are in bed.

"4. Again: the only day in the week when the working man's family can meet to have a comfortable dinner is on Sunday; but how can this be, if either the husband or the wife stay the usual forenoon Communion, which is not ordinarily over until past one?

"The working man's usual dinner hour is twelve, or soon afterwards; what logic will be sufficient to quiet the craving appetite of himself and his family for well nigh an hour and half beyond their proper time, which must be the necessary delay, if he lives any distance from the church and stays the midday Communion?

"But even should he stay, how hurried is he to reach his home—how, instantly on his arrival, must he sit down to the delayed meal—how all at once are the whole of the reflections

and solemn impressions of the service he has just left dispersed by the bustle of the wife and the exclamations of the children!

"5. This consideration, however, assumes a graver character, when it is taken in connexion with the fact, that in our working families (alas! is it so only with our working families?) the communicants are generally the exceptions; and should they, by staying for Holy Communion, trespass upon the usual arrangements for the important Sunday meal, little peace is there in the household for them! And when the young communicant by painful experience knows this to be the case, can we expect him to give that close, calm attention to the sacred service, which is so necessary for its proper enjoyment, and the realization of its benefits; or can we wonder, if in the face of such continued opposition, he should after the first warmth of his confirmation, or primal religious impressions, gradually discontinue his attendance? Was it not to avoid similar persecution, in their case however oftentimes of a physical, as well as of a moral kind, that the early Christians held their religious assemblies in the evenings, or at night, so that with them the nocturnal administration of the Lord's Supper was the rule, and not the exception?

"6. But it has been said, that if the Holy Communion be administered at any other time than before dinner, there is the danger of its being received upon a full stomach, and therefore with less likelihood of attention and devotion.

"With us, I can safely say, there is no such danger. Our working people dine at 12, or 12.30, and take their tea at 4, or 4.30, and our middle classes on Sundays dine not later than 1, or 1.30, and take tea at 5, or 5.30. Now, the time for the reception of Evening Communion cannot, with our arrangements, be before 8.30; for we have first Evening Prayer, then the Communion Service with Sermon; so that there can have been no food taken for three hours at the least before the hour of communicating, and no hearty meal for seven hours!

"7. I can truly say, that no services I have known have surpassed in solemnity and depth of devotional feeling the evening Communions, which I have the privilege of attending; and I think I can confidently appeal to all others, who have enjoyed the like privilege, for a corroboration of what I say. To which should be added, that there is this great special advantage attending them, that the communicants usually go away to a quiet

home, from all disturbing sights and influences, and should theirs be religious households, to family worship, and then to the retirement and final devotion of their own bedrooms.

"8. But it may be well to notice one other objection, which is not unfrequently made to the practice of evening Communions: 'Allowing all that has been said as to the desirableness and even necessity of some change from the usual forenoon administration of the Holy Communion, could not this be met and provided for by an early celebration; say at seven or eight o'clock, which would have the advantage of being more strictly in accordance with the mind of the Church, and be less liable to abuse?'

"My answer to such objectors is this: I have tried, and tried fairly, early Sunday morning Communions, and they do not succeed. Whatever be the case with the upper classes, with the working people, who can only have an extra hour of sleep on Sunday, (which they often greatly want, and which I believe is frequently a merciful allowance for them), such early services are not found in the long run either practicable or profitable. As an eminent London physician said to a friend of mine, 'I know not what may be the benefit of such early fasting services to your souls, but certainly they are very injurious to your bodies.'

"Then I should further dispute with the objectors alluded to, that evening Communion is not opposed to the mind of the Church, seeing that such was the time of its sacred institution by the Lord himself, the only time mentioned for its administration in the Acts of the Apostles, and the acknowledged hour in the Primitive Church, whilst our own Church has fixed no time, but left it to the discretion and convenience of the *minister* and congregation.

"Of course, with respect to its administration on other days not Sundays and general holydays, there can be no Communions for working people, except in the evenings; their hours of labour utterly preventing any general attendance at either a morning service, or at any other hour of the day; therefore such days, though provided for by the Church with special services, cannot be observed as the Church contemplates by the mass of the population, except by evening services and evening Communions.

"I will only add to what I have already said, that after twenty-seven years of labour amongst the working population of

this large town, and with great opportunities for studying their needs, and the difficulties of their peculiar circumstances, I am decidedly of opinion that the Church of England will never regain her influence over the masses, and no efforts of hers for that end will ever be successful, unless, in combination with the earnest, simple, and affectionate preaching of the full Gospel of Jesus Christ, she offers short services and frequent Communions, such as the Prayer-Book evidently contemplates and provides, at times when the people can conveniently attend them; the whole recommended to the consciences and feelings of those sought to be benefited by a humble, lowly, loving and self-sacrificing pastorate."

This note is already too long, but I cannot close it without quoting a passage from a letter which has recently appeared in the *Guardian* newspaper, by the Rev. James Skinner, formerly of Pimlico. He does not indeed plead for afternoon or evening Communions, but he ventures to urge that one may communicate at the hour now usual without being disadvantageously compared with the Churches on the Continent. He so far, in fact, agrees with what has been said above, as to consider the exact hour an open question, and to have been mercifully and charitably left so, both by Scripture and by our own Church. It was written from Prague, Sept. 23, 1860, after attending the opening of the Provincial Council.

"One thing I especially wish to note before I conclude. And I shall be glad if a contemporary of yours will observe what I say, and have some mercy on late communicants. I am an invalid, and have much sympathy with the many who, like myself, most usually receive Holy Communion after eleven o'clock in the day, and are hurt at being abused for it. Well, it was strange, certainly, but all the time during the long and interesting ceremony of opening the Provincial Council at the high altar, a priest was celebrating mass hard by, at the gorgeous shrine of St. George Nepomak; and it was not a private mass, but it was a low mass, with the administration. I saw the priest minister the consecrated wafer to at least twenty persons. Whether they were pilgrims to this popular shrine, and *could* not be there earlier, I cannot say. But there they were; and so it was. And I looked at my watch, and *the hour was twelve o'clock.*"

Page 331, *line* 21. 'Thorndike.' "Just Weights and Measures," c. xxii. § 5. On the lawfulness of separating the services, and

on the removal of any restriction of the hour of Communion Service at the last Review, see Wheatly's "Rational Illustration," &c. pp. 251, 252.

Besides the passages quoted from Thorndike in the text of the Lecture, see also his "Due Way of composing Differences," § 40 (Works, vol. v. p. 58, Oxford Edit.), and his "Just Weights and Measures," cxxii. § 10.

There are many cases, no doubt, in which an early service would be a great boon, especially to persons who live in towns, and walk out after attending church to visit their friends in the country. I have been told by a clergyman near Highgate, that many young men leave London at ten, attend his church at eleven, and then go on. This is an advantage to them, but perhaps an early service in their own church might have been better still. And it might attract others who are going to a greater distance.

Page 333, *line* 28. 'We should not brand those as Sabbath-breakers,' &c. 'if they change air and scene, consistently with the higher claims of the day.'

I subjoin two additional illustrations of the point urged in the preceding note. The former is from the Sermons of the late Mr. F. W. Robertson, "Series 1, Sermon VI."

"Again, that which is rest to one man is not rest to another. To require the illiterate man to read his Bible for some hours would impose a toil upon him, though it might be relaxation to you. To the labouring man a larger proportion of the day must be given to the recreation of his physical nature than is necessary for the man of leisure, to whom the spiritual observance of the day is easy, and seems all. Let us learn large, charitable considerateness. Let not the poor man sneer at his richer neighbour, if, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, he uses his horses to convey him to church, and not to the mere drive of pleasure; but then, in fairness, let not the rich man be shocked and scandalised if the over-wearied shopkeeper and artisan breathe the fresh air of heaven with their families in the country. 'The Sabbath was made for man.' Be generous, consistent, large-minded. A man may hold stiff, precise Jewish notions on this subject, but do not stigmatise that man as a formalist. Another may hold large, Paul-like views of the abrogation of the Fourth Commandment, and yet he may be sin-

cerely and zealously anxious for the hallowing of the day in his household and through the country. Do not call that man a Sabbath-breaker. Remember, the Pharisees called the Son of God a Sabbath-breaker. They kept the law of the Sabbath—they broke the law of love. Which was the worse to break? which was the higher to keep? Take care lest, in the zeal which seems to you to be for Christ, ye be found indulging their spirit, and not His."

The second passage is from the *Times* newspaper, for May 16th, 1856. It is valuable as a layman's view of the matter.

The writer just touches on the polemical history of the Lord's Day, and proceeds thus:—

"Here, then, are two theories of the day, and the English Sunday is a mixture of both. It is partly a Sabbath, partly a Festival. The popular religion connects a certain strictness with the day. Amusements which would be very proper on other days are not proper on that day. There is a certain quiet repose and gravity which is considered to suit it,—and abstinence from rough excitement and disorderly mirth. But some enjoyment and some festival feeling is still connected with the day. Go into any populous town on a Sunday, and, if it is at all a fine day, walk a mile or two on the road, or take the path through the fields. You will meet men, women, and children all looking their best, and wearing their brightest colours. Sunday hats and waistcoats, Sunday bonnets and shawls, come out of their dark recesses, and exchange their six days' torpor and flatness in the drawer for the shining stiffness of an actual wear. You meet family parties, married couples, engaged couples. These persons do not profess to be engaged in direct spiritual contemplation, nor do they think it wrong that they are not. No; their idea is that of quiet, harmless enjoyment. They take their stroll, and derive an innocent pleasure from the sun, the open air, the fields, and the sky,—from the quiet gossip which accompanies their saunter, and from having nothing particular to do or to think of for that day. Follow these saunterers to their homes, and you will see the same type of Sunday observance. It is a day for families to meet, talk, and be cheerful round the fireside, the tea-table, or the supper. Yet these persons would think it highly wrong to play at cards or to go to a play on a Sunday. This is the type of Sunday observance which more or less pervades English society.

It is a religious day, and a certain strictness is associated with it; yet together with the claims of public worship and the general gravity and quiet of the day is combined enjoyment; the Festival mingles with the Sabbath, and the Puritanical theory unites with the ecclesiastical. This is our traditional Sunday. Our English Sunday has, from the Reformation downwards, shown this mixed type, and rather obstinately adhered to it. Attempts from time to time have been made to wrench it one way or another way,—to pull it in the Puritanical direction or the other, to make it exclusively a Sabbath or a Festival; but they have invariably failed. The 'Book of Sports' in the days of the Stuarts was a bold attempt to convert it into the simple Festival; but it was a vain one. The Puritans would not dance, though it was solemnly enjoined on them, on peril of incarceration, by justices of the peace, and though they were led up to the sportive scene under the superintendence of constables. But the Puritans in their turn could not, when they got the upper hand, establish a Puritanical Sabbath, and persuade Englishmen to be morose, gloomy, and unhappy on that day.

"Such being, then, the traditional and established English Sunday, it would be well on the whole if people would agree to let our popular type of the day alone, without fretfully meddling with it. One party thinks we are not strict enough in our observance of the day; another party thinks we are too strict. So Sir Joshua Walmsley has his motion, and wants to introduce the continental Sunday. Mr. Baines wants to introduce the Puritan Sabbath."

Page 335, *line* 12. 'Other remedial measures . . . Church Festivals . . . Saturday half-holiday, and the like.' I have been told by various mercantile firms, employing and lodging a large number of young men and women, that since the adoption of an earlier hour of closing on Saturday, they have observed a great improvement, physically and morally, in their workpeople. *Before*, the late hours of Saturday so thoroughly wearied them, that on Sunday they were fit for nothing but listless animal rest, or rude bodily exercise. They had neither heart nor spirits for anything relating to their souls. *Now*, they will rise earlier and more cheerfully, occupy themselves well in the house-library till church-time, go to church, and after dinner take the bodily recreation which they really need; or they go

to their friends from church, and thus fall under good influences. This restoration of Sunday to something more befitting man's Divine nature and higher destiny is attributable in a great measure to partial intermission of work on Saturday. Many can now get a game of cricket on Saturday; many others secure relaxation in other harmless ways; and none, in houses thus regulated, can now say that they have no opportunity of attending to their bodily health, except at the expense of that of their souls, or *vice versâ*. This plea used often to be urged, and it was very difficult to meet it. I am sure that nothing is wanting to make this happy change general, but a resolve on the part of purchasers to refrain from late shopping on Saturday. The workpeople are most anxious, the employers are most willing, to carry it out. Is it much for a Christian community to stretch forth a helping hand to what will tend to the benefit of their brethren, and to the honor of their Lord, and of His Day? I believe also—for I have had the subject mentioned by those who should be well informed—that a quarterly holiday, (not necessarily a Church holy-day, but if that, so much the better), would be heartily welcomed, if ordered by Government. The days suggested have been Easter Monday, Midsummer Day, Michaelmas Day, and Christmas Day, Good Friday being thrown in, and perhaps thus saved from its present desecration, by being no longer one of the *two days* in the year, besides Sundays, on which labour ceases. Again: multiplication of holidays would give persons an opportunity of learning to use them irreproachably. We are told sometimes that English operatives do not know how to employ a leisure day. What chance have they had of gaining such knowledge, for many, many years past?

Page 336, *line* 4. 'To begin with children,' &c. See the well-known "Essay on Church Parties," Edinb. Rev. No. CC. for Oct. 1853, ascribed to the late Mr. Conybeare.

"But the most conspicuous example of Judaizing tendencies in the party is furnished by their Sabbatarian views. In defiance of the clearest expressions of Scripture—in defiance of the universal consent of all foreign Churches, Catholic and Protestant—in defiance of the express declarations of the Reformers, but in accordance with the traditions of the Scotch and English Puritans—they teach that the Christian Lord's Day is identical with the Jewish Sabbath. Nay, they require that it should be observed

with a stern severity, unknown even to the Mosaic ritual. The effect of such an observance upon those who submit to it for conscience' sake is, we freely own, most beneficial. Nor does it differ materially from that observance of the day which is the highest privilege of the Christian. Those who know how much we need every help to raise our thoughts above the turmoil of the world, will feel thankful that they are permitted to rest from earthly cares and amusements on the Sunday. They will be ready to exclaim with Herbert—

> 'O day most calm, most bright,
> The fruit of this, the next world's bud,
> The week were dark, but for thy light.'

"But the Puritans have always enforced this religious privilege of the advanced Christians, as if it had been a command compulsory upon all men. And they have enforced it, moreover, in its negative and prohibitory aspect; where they could, by penal laws; everywhere by damnatory denunciations. Thousands are thus alienated from piety by associating it from their earliest childhood with a day of gloom and restriction, imposed upon them by arbitary force.

* * * * * *

"The child is father of the man, and a childhood thus trained too often fathers a manhood of impiety; yet it is not on those who can be constrained, whether by force or persuasion, to Sabbatize, that the bad effects are most serious; the real sufferers are the working millions, whom nature, shut out by steam-engine and spinning-jenny during the week, draws forth on the day of rest to refresh their lungs with purer air, and their eyes and hearts with gazing on the unspoiled works of their Creator. Religion is too often known to these multitudes in the Puritan form alone. They have been taught by their spiritual guides, both Episcopalian and Dissenting, that it is 'Sabbath-breaking' to look upon green fields and running brooks; and that Sabbath-breaking is as great a sin as drunkenness or fornication. Thus their Sunday pleasures, in themselves so innocent, are turned into guilts. Being placed under the ban of religion, they become reckless of her restraints. As they are Sabbath-breakers already, they think they may as well be drunkards too; and when upon the wings of steam they have left the smoky town far behind, they

vary their excursions by a visit, not to the rural church, (whither by wiser treatment they might easily have been won), but to the roadside alehouse. Thus the masses are brutalised and degraded by the attempt to raise them prematurely to a high degree of spiritual advancement."

For a passage very similar in character, and especially descriptive of the results of the northern "Sabbath" upon the minds of many young persons, see a Scottish publication, called "The Panoply," vol. i. p. 284. In the course of it is cited "a favorite saying of a late Judge in the Court of Justiciary, and himself a Presbyterian, that it was not Sabbath-breaking, but Sabbath-keeping that was the beginning of almost all crime." By "Sabbath-keeping," he meant, as the context shows, such constraint of children on the Lord's Day as Mr. Conybeare in this note, and Dr. Miller in the following note, so earnestly deprecate.

Page 337, *line* 11. 'Dr. Miller.' I subjoin an extract, not less remarkable for its outspoken boldness than for its truth, from a speech by this gentleman. It was delivered at the anniversary of the "Sunday School Union," May 3, 1855. (He alludes to the subject in his letter, quoted in note to Lecture VIII. p. 330, l. 20.)

"I do not believe there is a single father upon this platform, or in this hall, who would attempt, if he had a grain of common sense, to deal with his own children as we have been dealing with the children of the poor. Who that knows the elasticity of a child's body and mind, and the difficulty of keeping it still, even at family prayer, would ever dream, if he thought at all on the subject, of overtasking the physical and mental powers of children, as we have so long been doing on the Lord's Day? I know how it is in Birmingham, and I suppose it is much the same elsewhere. Our children come down to school at nine or a quarter past nine o'clock; many of them having to leave their homes an hour, or nearly so, before that, and they very often come with a half-finished slice of bread and butter in their hands. The child is taken into the school, and first of all there is a religious service; then you sit down to lessons, and now and then the child is placed under the care of the kind of teacher to whom I have a great objection, and that is a preaching teacher. Well, when the child has gone through all this, he is taken to church or chapel. I will take the case of my own church, and

then I shall not appear invidious. Whatever praises may be lavished upon the Liturgy of the Church of England, it is not one in all its parts specially attractive to little children. Then in our churches—I do not know how it is among Nonconformists—these young ones are placed in a gallery, far off, and almost out of sight of the pulpit, where they very often get the benefit of all the hot and foul air of the place; and there you see these poor little unhappy creatures cracking nuts, peeling oranges, and engaged in all sorts of things which disturb the congregation, and distress their teachers. Well, you keep them there under a very good and eloquent sermon as I am bound to suppose, but, in my case, a very long one; and then, at a quarter to one, you let them out, and you turn round and imagine, that having gone through this round for years, they will, at the age of seventeen, having left your school, be so enamoured of it and all connected with it, that they will come back and become regular attendants at your churches and chapels, to hear your sermons and your prayers. Now, I for one say the whole thing is a mistake; and I maintain that one of the reasons—I would say the only reason—why you have to be perpetually asking, 'What has become of the working classes who were brought up in our Sunday-schools?' is the way in which you have thus detached them from you on the Lord's Day. And I cannot but call to mind an anecdote, which I heard from an excellent clergyman, who told me that a boy, brought up in his Sunday-school, on one occasion passing the church, said to his companion, as he heard the bell ringing for service, with a look of extreme disgust, 'I hate that bell;'—and why? It was because he had there heard services associated with weariness in his mind. And though I am fully alive to the difficulty which I feel, more strongly, perhaps, as a clergyman of the Church of England, of dissociating the minds' of children from the actual attendance on the very sanctuary of God—and I feel that there is a great deal to be said on this point, and I do not wonder at ministers feeling this—yet I say, if we can only devise some plan of suitable religious services, especially with regard to the younger children, we shall most unquestionably be solving one of the greatest difficulties of the day; most effectually promoting the religious instruction of the young; and I venture to say, that when those who are now children in our schools are adults, those who follow us will

not have to look round upon the empty free seats of our places of worship, and ask despondingly, 'Where are the working classes?'" See also Dr. Miller's Sermon, "The Dying Judge's Charge," pp. 26, 27.

Page 339, *line* 11. 'Let us resolve that we who can rest at other times,' &c.

Fuller speaks on this subject, Church History, vol. vi. p. 93: "A worthy doctor, (Dr. Paul Micklethwaite), who in his sermons at the Temple no less piously than learnedly handled the point of the Lord's Day, worthily pressed that gentlefolk were obliged to a stricter observation of the Lord's Day than labouring people. *The whole have no need of the physician, but those who are sick.* Such as are not annihilated with labour have no title to be recreated with liberty. Let servants, whose hands are ever working whilst their eyes are waking; let such who all the foregoing week have their cheeks moistened with sweat, and hands hardened with labour; let such have some recreation on the Lord's Day indulged unto them; whilst persons of quality, who may be said to keep Sabbath all the week long, I mean who rest from hard labour, are concerned in conscience to observe the Lord's Day with the greater abstinence from recreation."

Page 339, *line* 22. 'Suggest principles towards their solution.' The Rev. G. J. Gowring, of Banbury, in a small and unpretending volume, called "Sermons on the Lord's Day," &c. Oxford, 1855, has some valuable remarks on "The Observance of the Lord's Day." See his Twelfth Sermon. The Christian Knowledge Society has a most excellent and cheerful little tract addressed to peasants, and entitled "How to spend Sunday." It is marked No. 731.

Page 340, *line* 12. 'Bishop Horsley,' Serm. 23.

"Perhaps a better general rule cannot be laid down than this, that the same proportion of the Sabbath, on the whole, should be devoted to religious exercises, public and private, as every man would spend of any other day in his ordinary business. The holy work of the Sabbath, like all other work, to be done well, requires intermissions. An entire day is a longer space of time than the human mind can employ with alacrity upon any one subject. The austerity, therefore, of those is little to be commended, who require that all the intervals of public worship, and whatever remains of the day after the public duty is satis-

fied, should be spent in the closet, in private prayer and retired meditation. Nor are persons in the lower ranks of society to be very severely censured—those especially who are confined in populous cities, where they breathe a noxious atmosphere, and are engaged in unwholesome occupations, from which, with their daily subsistence, they derive their daily poison—if they take advantage of the leisure of the day to recruit their wasted strength and harassed spirits by short excursions into the purer air of the adjacent villages, and the innocent recreations of sober society, provided they engage not in schemes of dissipated and tumultuous pleasure, which may disturb the sobriety of their thoughts, and interfere with the duties of the day."

The use of the word Sabbath, and indeed the course of his argument throughout his three Sermons on the subject, show to what school Bp. Horsley belongs. But it is instructive to find him, nevertheless, so practical and so merciful. His own rule, quoted in the text, scarcely does him justice.

Page 340, *line* 19. 'High heaven,' &c. Wordsworth's "Eccl. Sonnets," xliii.

Page 341, *line* 2. 'Bene præcipiunt.' Cic. "De Offic." i. 9.

Page 341, *line* 3. 'St. Paul.' Rom. xiv. 23.

Page 341, *line* 13. 'Domine Deus,' &c. Augustin. "De Trin." lib. xv. c. xviii.

Page 342, *line* 19. 'The day which, in our foolishness.' This is in accordance with what has been said all along, that man feels the need of periodic worship of God, but that he is directed to the particular time of it by special external revelations. Such revelation supposed away, as the Jew would not have selected a septenary religious day, the Sabbath, so the Christian would not have selected the Sunday. Though each felt the want, he would not otherwise have met it in that particular way.

THE END.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.


00059069

Digitized with financial assistance from
Mr.Aneesh Vasant Pradhan
on 21 February, 2019